

CHAPTER TWO

ALTERNATIVES

As presented in Chapter 1, the Purpose and Need for the West Mojave Route Network Project (WMRNP) is to adopt a comprehensive framework for transportation management and specific travel management network and other implementation strategies in Limited Access Areas of the West Mojave Planning Area that (1) limits conflicts and threats to sensitive resources, (2) responds to current and anticipated future transportation and travel needs, (3) provides appropriate recreational access, and (4) is consistent with the overall motor vehicle access and conservation goals of the 2006 WEMO Plan. Additionally, the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) will analyze grazing impacts on specific resources in response to the Court's statements of inadequacy.

The Transportation and Travel Management goal of the 2006 WEMO Plan is to provide appropriate motorized vehicle access to public lands for commercial, recreational, and other purposes in a manner that is compatible with species conservation. This EIS supplements the 2006 WEMO Plan and has been developed to be consistent with the conservation goals of the 2006 WEMO Plan, which remain in effect where pertinent to public lands. The conservation goals of the 2006 West Mojave Plan are to develop a regional biological strategy to conserve plant and animal species and their habitats and to prevent future listings; and to provide an equitable and cost-effective process for complying with threatened and endangered species laws. More specific conservation objectives and strategies associated with the various plant and animal species are outlined in Chapter 2 of the 2006 WEMO Plan. New disturbance limitations that have been adopted for many sensitive areas in the 2006 WEMO Plan, also establish a general limitation on new road construction across broad landscapes. A few of the conservation objectives and strategies associated with various species include specific parameters for transportation management in identified locations.

The West Mojave Route Network Project (WMRNP) plan amendment and adopted travel network must comply FLPMA, Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, BLM's regulations that establish "designation criteria" for OHV routes, in 43 CFR 8342.1, and follow BLM Handbook 1610-1, Appendix C, Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management, BLM Manual 1626, Travel and Transportation Management, and BLM's Travel and Transportation Management (TTM) Handbook (H 8342, BLM 2012) to provide an implementation framework for route designations in the WEMO Planning Area. This chapter describes the Land Use Plan (LUP)-level decisions and implementation-level activity decisions (including travel network alternatives) that are analyzed in Chapter 4 of this SEIS.

Four alternatives are described in this chapter and analyzed in Chapter 4 of this SEIS that provide both a framework to designate routes and an implementation-level transportation network and strategies to manage the risks and evaluate impacts of the transportation system. In addition, the four alternatives in this chapter and analyzed in Chapter 4 evaluate livestock grazing in the planning area. The action alternatives further limit livestock grazing in DWMA's beyond those restrictions contained in the 2006 WEMO Plan (see Alternative 1 – No Action). All action alternatives also propose the discontinuation of livestock grazing throughout the planning area on inactive, vacant grazing allotments, making them unavailable for livestock grazing.

Alternative 1 is the No Action alternative, and utilizes the existing management approach as adopted by the 2006 WEMO Plan, updated by changes in data, policy, and circumstances, including court decisions, consistent with the BLM's LUP regulations in 1610.5-5. The 2006 WEMO Plan approach utilizes 1980 CDCA Plan Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element and associated Recreation Element goals, applies broad regional access management strategies to manage risks and impacts to specific resources across broad areas of the West Mojave, and supplements the strategy with site-specific strategies to address resource values and site conditions. Implementation priorities and strategies are outlined in the plan and driven by the goals and objectives of the 2006 WEMO Plan. Various route designation inconsistencies between the 1980 CDCA Plan and the 2006 WEMO Plan are not addressed in the No Action Alternative.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 each amend the CDCA Plan MVA and Recreation Element goals and objectives to integrate with the route designation parameters and broad regional strategies developed in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and with current transportation management guidance. Alternative 2 provides a transportation management framework and more stringent minimization and mitigation triggers based on each regulatory designation criteria. These triggers result in development of a route network alternative that minimizes conflicts and threats to sensitive resources by closing or limiting routes as a primary means to reduce the sensitive resource conflicts and threats and identifying where mitigation is appropriate. Alternative 3 provides a transportation management framework and somewhat less stringent triggers based on each regulatory designation criteria. These triggers result in development of a route network alternative that minimizes conflicts and threats to sensitive resources by mitigating conflicts and threats, with an emphasis on appropriate mitigation measures, rather than route closure or limitation as the primary mechanism to reduce conflicts and threats. Alternative 4 is not developed using the triggers at the outset because it is a modification of No Action. Alternative 4 utilizes the No Action network as adopted by the 2006 WEMO Plan, and modifies the No Action route network in response to specific agency, community, and public comments to recognize specific travel needs. The triggers are then applied to address the designation criteria and make adjustments to the network to minimize conflicts and impacts to sensitive resources, including those specified in 43 CFR 8342.1. The thresholds used to trigger review for adjustments to the network are similar to those applied under Alternative 3. Mitigation strategies are then applied, including closure, to reduce conflicts and threats to sensitive resources. These approaches result in a range in management commitments for implementation and compliance, but do not result in a more or less aggressive approach to pursuing compliance. The Alternatives also address the Court's direction that at least one of the alternatives designate a network with less than 5,098 miles of routes.

The development and description of alternatives in this chapter are organized as follows:

- Section 2.1 provides a summary of access management decisions, both at the land use plan and the implementation or activity level to address the goals and objectives of the WMRNP;
- The Land Use Planning Alternatives are described in Section 2.2;
- Section 2.3 summarizes all features of each alternative, including the agency's preferred alternative;
- Section 2.4 provides a comparative summary of the alternatives;

- The alternatives considered, but not carried forward for detailed evaluation, are described in Section 2.5; and
- Procedures for modifying the Plan are provided in Section 2.6.

Definitions that are used throughout this document that the reader should be familiar with include the following:

- The term “access” may refer to any type of linear ground access, whether for motorized, non-motorized (e.g., mountain bike), or non-mechanized use (e.g., horse, hiking).
- A “route” also includes all types of access, unless otherwise specified.
- A “closed” route is the term used in the 2006 WEMO plan to indicate that a designated route is unavailable for motorized use.
- A “transportation linear disturbance” is the term now used in BLM travel management guidance to indicate that a designated route is unavailable for motorized use—that it is essentially “closed”, and has not otherwise been identified as a specialized trail, such as the Pacific Crest Trail. While there are nuanced differences, generally closed routes and transportation linear disturbances are equivalent, and are used interchangeably in this document.
- A “limited” route is the term used in the 2006 WEMO Plan for a designated route that has been limited to specified uses or users, generally for authorized users (permittees) or for the agency, and occasionally, for specific uses, seasons, or vehicle types.
- All routes available for use outside of OHV Open areas are now considered “limited” because they are located in Limited access areas. This document indicates whether and how each route is limited.
- The majority of “limited” routes in this plan are not restricted to any one type of use. These routes are indicated as “limited to motorized use” routes; they are roughly equivalent to “open” routes in the No Action alternative.
- Other “limited” routes do have restrictions. These restrictions have specified categories. Restrictions could include restricting use to specific vehicle types, to non-motorized travel, or to a specific type of non-motorized travel (such as bicycling), to seasonal use, to non-mechanized travel (equestrian/pack animal, canoe, hiking, skiing), or to one type of non-mechanized travel. May also include restriction of the route to administrative (agency) use or authorized (by permit or other signed approval) use.
- An “open” route is the term used in the 2006 WEMO Plan for a designated route that is available for motorized use outside of OHV Open Areas, and on rare occasions for specific motorized vehicle types and uses, as indicated by the route number (i.e. “M” routes for motorcycles and “C” routes for competitive use routes).
- A “trigger” is the term used to describe any one of the 29 factors used to signal the need to review a route for application of minimization or mitigation.

See the glossary for other terms used in this document.

2.1 Land-Use Plan Management, CDCA Plan Amendment, and Implementation Decisions to be Made

The WMRNP requires both LUP-level decisions and implementation-level activity decisions to be made to accomplish the Purpose and Need.

2.1.1 Background to Land-Use Plan - Level Decisions

The WMRNP is in response, in part, to the US District Court's Summary Judgment and the pertinent Remedy Order that are available on BLM's West Mojave website at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/wemo_court_mandates.html. The Court vacated the route designation portion of the 2006 WEMO Plan and ordered BLM to revisit certain aspects of the 2006 WEMO Plan and its route designation decisions. In addition, the 1994 California Desert Protection Act (CDPA) and subsequent wilderness legislation has yet to be incorporated into the Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the CDCA Plan. Thirdly, BLM has adopted a Bureau-wide Transportation and Travel Management (TTM) System which provides for more inclusive travel management decisions. Finally, the CDCA Plan includes some mitigation measures for access impacts that are being revisited. BLM is considering here the extent to which these are still appropriately plan-level decisions.

The Motor Vehicle Access LUP-level decisions are being made at two levels:

- A. Establishment of the general travel management framework goals and objectives for access management in the West Mojave Planning area. This includes establishment of Travel Management Areas (TMAs) as the geographical basis for implementation of the route management plans, and establishing the goals and objectives to be accomplished with the resulting transportation network; and
- B. Adoption of specific Plan Amendment decisions that are necessary to address 2006 WEMO Plan inconsistencies with the CDCA Plan's Motorized Vehicle Access Element, and/or would support the goals and objectives of the WMRNP. Some of the proposed planning-level decisions identified in the alternatives specifically respond, in part, to the US District Court findings and remanded portions of the 2006 WEMO Plan, as discussed later in this chapter.

The Livestock Grazing LUP-level decisions include:

- A. Livestock Grazing Element changes are being made to reflect voluntary relinquishment, boundary and forage allocation updates, expressed as Animal Unit Months or AUMs, on two specific allotments that have donated valid grazing leases under authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act.
- B. Additional Livestock Grazing Program LUP-level decisions are being considered in response to Summary Judgment Order direction. The Summary Judgment Order (page 42, footnote 33) indicated "Plaintiffs also argue that the FEIS's range of alternatives was insufficient because none of the alternatives would end grazing in the DWMAs and U.S. Fish and Wildlife desert tortoise critical habitat units (CHU) as recommended in the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan....The Court finds it unnecessary to decide whether the range of alternatives is also deficient on this ground....On remand the BLM will consider a host of factors, including grazing issues, in its alternatives analysis."

2.1.2 Planning Decisions

Specific planning decisions to be made in the WMRNP include LUP-level decisions which are amendments to the Plan, as well as non-plan amendment (activity-level) decisions made to implement elements of the CDCA Plan. The LUP-level decisions are summarized in Table 2.1-1.

Table 2.1-1. Summary of LUP-Level Decisions in the West Mojave Route Network Project

Component	Affected Section of CDCA Plan (1999 Reprint)	Summary of Draft Amendment
Draft Plan Amendment Decisions to be Made Under All Action Alternatives		
PA I: Change the CDCA Plan language that limits the WEMO route network to existing routes of travel as of 1980.	Pg. 77, Limited Area, reference to “existing routes of travel”. Similar language on Page 81, Interim Management. Also, Table 1, Line 14.	References to existing routes of travel would be deleted, and replaced with language describing the process for designating a travel network in accordance with 43 CFR 8342.1 and the BLM TTM Handbook.
PA II: Update the CDCA Plan to incorporate the TTM process.	Pgs. 77-78, Route Designations. Pg. 76, Area Designations; Pg. 77, Limited Areas; and Pg. 79, Limited Areas.	Discussions of open, limited, and closed route designations in the CDCA Plan would be updated to conform to the definitions in BLM’s TTM Handbook. In general, the linking of route designations to Multiple Use Classes (MUC) would be eliminated. MUC may be a criterion in making individual route decisions in designating the travel network, but is not a replacement for the overall decision process.
PA III: Update OHV Area designations in the CDCA Plan to reflect changes made through wilderness designations.	Pg. 77, Open Area, Reference to Class I, and Table 8.	The Plan amendment would update OHV Area designations that were previously designated as Limited Areas, but which have since been closed due to designation of wilderness or other legislative actions.
PA IV: Identify CDCA Plan amendment triggers.	Pg. 82, Revisions	The section of the Plan would be modified to provide triggers to determine when a Plan Amendment is required during future changes to the designated travel network.
PA V: Update the livestock grazing program in the CDCA Plan to reflect changes made under authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act (Public Law 112-74).	Pg. 58, Allocations for livestock grazing	This Plan Conformance action would update the CDCA Plan to reflect that the Lava Mountain and Walker Pass Common Allotments have been permanently relinquished and the AUMs in these two allotments have been reallocated from livestock forage and use to wildlife use and ecosystem functions.
Proposed Plan Amendment Decisions Which Would be Varied Among Alternatives		
PA VI: Designate Framework by adopting Travel Management Areas (TMAs) and associated objectives.	Not designated in current CDCA Plan	TMAs would be designated, in accordance with BLM’s TTM Handbook, to facilitate travel management planning.
PA VII: Update parameters for organized competitive event access and corridors.	Pg. 71, parameters for management of competitive events.	The Plan amendment would update specific parameters for the management of competitive events, and potentially eliminate the Johnson Valley to Parker Competitive Corridor.

Table 2.1-1. Summary of LUP-Level Decisions in the West Mojave Route Network Project

Component	Affected Section of CDCA Plan (1999 Reprint)	Summary of Draft Amendment
PA VIII: Modify general access designations related to washes, sand dunes, and dry lakes.	Pg. 78, discussion of Washes, Sand Dunes, and Dry Lakes, and Table 9.	The Plan amendment would update the descriptions of approved access to specific wash, dune, and dry lake areas.
PA IX: Change the 2006 WEMO Plan limitations on motorized access into the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Area.	2006 WEMO Plan ROD, Pg. 15-16.	Eliminate the requirement for a permit, obtained through a formal process, to enter the designated access network in the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Area.
PA X: Change the CDCA Plan and WEMO Plan limits on stopping and parking adjacent to designated routes in the WEMO Plan area.	Pg. 78, Stopping and Parking	The CDCA Plan's limitation on stopping and parking more than 300 feet from routes of travel would be modified to meet access and resource protection objectives.
PA XI: Reallocate AUMs and modify allotment boundaries for those allotments in DWMA, USFWS designated critical habitat, or otherwise inactive.	Pg. 58, Allocations for livestock grazing	Eliminate livestock grazing in DWMA, designated critical habitat or other inactive allotments and reallocate AUMs.

All action alternatives include Plan Amendment decisions to address inconsistencies between the CDCA Plan, the 2006 WEMO Plan, and current regulations and policy, as well as to provide a consistent baseline for analysis of alternatives. The No Action alternative would not resolve these inconsistencies; existing plan decisions would stay in place. Other CDCA Plan Amendment decisions are also being considered under the action alternatives in order to meet specific motor-vehicle access goals and objectives of the alternatives and to address other aspects of the Court Orders, such as elimination of grazing in DWMA. The rationale for and specific description of each plan amendment decision are provided in the following subsections.

Proposed Plan Amendment and Conformance Decisions under All Action Alternatives

The following proposed plan amendments and plan conformance updates are proposed in the West Mojave Route Network Project, and would be the same under all action alternatives.

PA I: Limiting Route Network to 1980 Baseline

The current language in the CDCA Plan within "Limited" areas provides a 1980 inventory that is interpreted to be the universe of routes from which "approved routes" can be identified. The CDCA Plan's Motorized Vehicle Access Element discussion of allowable vehicle use in OHV "Limited" areas reads as follows:

"At the minimum, use will be restricted to existing routes of travel. An existing route of travel is a route established before approval of the Desert Plan in 1980,

with a minimum width of two feet, showing significant surface evidence of prior vehicle use or, for washes, history of prior use.”

The language creates an unmanageable situation 35 years after the approval of the CDCA Plan. For one thing, the 1980 route network continues to be in dispute due to the limitations of the source data, and is poorly known. Also, there is much confusion over the interpretation of the sentence that, “At a minimum, use will be restricted to existing routes of travel.” Also, the 1980 network has undergone substantial changes, both planned and unplanned, and applied to a public land base that is significantly different than it was in 1980 as a result of major acquisitions, donations, and exchanges.

Ultimately, the language in the CDCA Plan no longer serves current transportation and travel management needs, and there is no assurance it responds appropriately to sensitive issues. The existing routes language as it is currently interpreted, is also in conflict with how route designation was conducted in the 2006 WEMO Plan, in various ACEC Plans, and in approving rights-of-way and other permits since the approval of the 1980 CDCA Plan. In response, BLM proposes to revise the CDCA Plan to be consistent with current regulatory and management policy regarding designation of routes for motorized vehicle access, and to provide a mechanism for designating, limiting, or closing routes as new issues arise, on-the-ground information or needs change, and new public lands are acquired.

Based on a review of the Court’s Summary Judgment order, BLM has determined that the language in the 1980 CDCA Plan restricting travel to existing routes does not conform to the procedures required in BLM’s Travel and Transportation Management (TTM) Handbook (H-8342). The TTM Handbook establishes procedures for making route designations, including establishing new routes, and makes no reference to restricting BLM from establishing new routes. Also, BLM’s other management responsibilities under FLPMA, including providing access for minerals exploration and issuing rights-of-way, leases, and other grants for new and existing facilities, demands consideration of new routes to provide access to those activities and facilities. The CDCA Plan recognized FLPMA access needs and made a distinction between public access and authorized access. The TTM Handbook recognizes the interconnected nature of transportation and travel, whether for public access or access for specified users, uses, or to access non-public lands. Now, in compliance with the requirements of the Court, the current planning action is proposed to consider modification of the CDCA Plan language that is not in conformance with the current TTM guidance and which is inconsistent with BLM’s other management responsibilities under FLPMA.

As a result, the BLM proposes to modify the MVA Element and to eliminate the current “Limited to existing routes” language and replace it with language to reflect that use will be “restricted to designated routes of travel”, except as otherwise indicated in Limited Access Areas. The specific routes, as well additional mechanisms and thresholds for their modification, would be identified and updated in travel management plans and through other mechanisms to keep the plans current. Broader network thresholds may be established at the LUP level for the entire network, and at the LUP or Activity Plan level for particular travel management areas, or other appropriate polygons.

PA II: Update Route Designation Process to Conform to TTM Handbook

The current CDCA Plan language is based on the former policy of designating individual routes in Limited Access Areas as Open, Limited, or Closed. The Open, Limited, Closed Route terminology has now been expanded to provide information on the specific users and uses of each route. The original terms are relevant but no longer adequate under the new TTM Handbook guidance, and would be augmented and replaced with a discussion of the current policy for designation of the travel network. The CDCA Plan also did not include designation of non-motorized or non-mechanized routes as part of a travel network, so these requirements of the TTM process would be incorporated into the CDCA Plan.

In addition, the existing CDCA Plan discusses route designations within the context of Multiple Use Class (MUC) designations, including blanket designations of routes in large areas based only on the MUC. While MUC may be one factor to be considered in designation of the travel network, this procedure does not consider route-specific resource conflicts as required by 43 CFR 8342.1. Therefore, the language making the route designations based only on MUC would be modified to conform with the TTM Handbook guidance.

PA III: Conform the Plan to Legislatively-Triggered Changes to Area Designations

Access Area boundaries within the WEMO Planning Area are being conformed to reflect post-2006 changes that result from legislation, to conform the CDCA Plan and to clarify the decision-making space for the WMRNP. Approximately 24,404 acres located north of Joshua Tree National Park and south of CA Hwy 62, that were previously designated as “limited” for OHV routes, are now “closed” to OHV. This area was designated as the Pinto Mountains Wilderness in San Bernardino County per the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, PL 111-111.

Legislation titled the Military Lands Withdrawals Act of 2013 was passed as an element of PL 113-66, which expanded the 29 Palms Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC) adjacent to the Johnson Valley OHV Open Area. Congress modified Alternative 6 of the MCAGCC’s *29 Palms Training Land/Airspace Acquisition Project* FEIS enabling the USMC to withdraw lands to the south and west of the current 29 Palms MCAGCC within an Exclusive Military Use Area (EMUA), and to also conduct Marine Expeditional Brigade (MEB) level live-fire training while increasing the amount of land available for recreational use in a Shared Use Area (SUA). The MCAGCC Expansion includes approximately 79,000 acres to the west, and approximately 19,000 acres to the south, of the 29 Palms MCGACC that were withdrawn for the EMUA, and to be managed by the Secretary of the Navy.

In the legislation, approximately 53,000 acres is designated as a Shared Use Area (SUA) to be managed by the Secretary of the Interior (i.e., public lands under the jurisdiction of BLM) for public recreation during any period in which the land is not being used for military training and as determined suitable for public use, as well as natural resource conservation. For two 30-day periods per year, the SUA will be used and managed by the Secretary of the Navy for military training. The SUA together with approximately 43,000 acres to the west of the authorized MCAGCC withdrawal boundary has been designated as the *Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area* in PL 113-66, totaling approximately 96,000 acres. BLM will continue to manage the *Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area* under the provisions of the Johnson Valley OHV Area Plan, as updated by provisions of PL 113-66.

PA IV: Identify Plan Amendment Triggers to conform to TTM Handbook

The 2006 WEMO Plan LUP amendment triggers would be updated to reflect current Transportation and Travel Management guidance that addresses changes to site-specific designations and implementation strategies as activity planning decisions rather than Land-Use Planning decisions. Broad strategies, such as those for stopping, parking and camping over broad landscapes, would remain as land-use planning decisions. Site-specific decisions, such as the designation of specific camping or staging areas or the opening or closure of specific lakebeds could be made either as plan amendment decisions or as activity planning decisions within the applicable travel management plan, depending on other aspects of the LUP and consistency with other activity plans.

PA V: Conform the Grazing Program Allocations to Reflect post-2006 WEMO Plan Changes

Since the approval of the ROD for the 2006 WEMO Plan, the status of grazing allotments within the planning area has changed as a result of other factors besides the 2006 WEMO Plan decisions. Most of the grazing allotments remained actively grazed and conformed to any applicable grazing prescription changes made in the 2006 WEMO Plan.

The following Table 2.1-2 lists the status of the grazing allotment within the West Mojave Planning Area in 2014, as a result of the 2006 WEMO Plan and subsequent actions which follow from the 2006 WEMO Plan implementation.

Table 2.1-2. Allotment Status 2014

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	Active or Inactive in 2012
Antelope Valley	5052	Active
Boron	5057	Active
Bissell	5050	Active
Buckhorn Canyon	8012	Inactive
Cady Mountain	8006	Inactive
Cronese Lake	8007	Inactive
Darwin		Incorporated into LCM
Double Mountain		Inactive
Gravel Hills	8008	Inactive
Hansen Common	5006	Active
Harper Lake	8004	Inactive
Johnson Valley	8014	Inactive
Kelso Peak	5002	Active
Lacey-Cactus-McCloud (LCM)	5012	Active
Lava Mountain		Permanently relinquished under the authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act
Monolith-Cantil	5007	Active
Oak Creek		Inactive
Olancho	5011	Active
Ord Mountain	8005	Active
Pilot Knob	5056	Voluntarily relinquished
Rattlesnake Canyon	8003	Active

Table 2.1-2. Allotment Status 2014

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	Active or Inactive in 2012
Round Mountain	8013	Active
Rudnick Common	5008	Active
Shadow Mountain	8011	Active
Spangler Hills	5055	Active
Stoddard Mountain-Middle Unit	8010	Active
Superior Valley	8002	Inactive
Tunawee Common	5009	Active
Valley Well	8001	Active
Walker Pass Common		Permanently relinquished under the authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act.
Warren	5051	Active

In 2012, Congress passed and the President signed the 2012 Appropriations Act (Public Law 112-74, 125 Stat. 1048, Dec 23, 2011). This Act provided that the Secretary of the Interior “shall accept the donation of any valid existing permits or leases authorizing grazing on public lands within the California Desert Conservation Area. With respect to each permit or lease donated under this paragraph, the Secretary shall terminate the grazing permit or lease, ensure a permanent end (except as provided in paragraph (2)), to grazing on the land covered by the permit or lease, and make the land available for mitigation by allocation the forage to wildlife use consistent with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan, section 10(a)(1)(B) permit or section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973”.

Under this authority, two allotments have been donated within the WEMO Planning area—Lava Mountain and Walker Pass Common Allotments. Consistent with the 2012 Appropriations Act, the permanent relinquishment of the grazing preference for these two allotments has been accepted and AUMs were reallocated from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions. The CDCA Plan will be conformed to reflect these changes.

Proposed Plan Amendment Decisions Which Vary among Action Alternatives

The following proposed plan amendment decisions would vary by alternative. None of these six decisions would be taken under the No Action Alternative. The specific features of the decisions under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are described in Sections 2.2 and 2.3.

PA VI: Designate Framework by Adopting TMAs and Associated Objectives

The 2012 BLM TTM Handbook specifies that BLM can delineate Travel Management Areas (TMAs) that meet the LUP objectives for each alternative. TMAs may be developed based on areas with unique or shared circumstances, high levels of controversy, or complex resource considerations. TMAs are an optional planning tool to frame transportation issues and help delineate travel networks to address specific uses and resource concerns. Based on the large size of the WEMO Planning Area, BLM proposes to designate TMAs to facilitate the development of activity plans. Each TMA would ultimately have an established set of objectives that govern the

designation of the transportation network, as well as future changes to the network, based on the alternative selected for that TMA.

PA VII: Update Parameters for Competitive Event Access

The 1980 CDCA Plan allows organized competitive events to be permitted on routes in Multiple Use Class (MUC) Moderate (M) and Limited (L), subject to specific parameters. Competitive events in MUC L are confined to paved or maintained roads, with the exception of four identified long-distance race courses. The intent was to readdress the use of routes for competitive events when route designation occurred (CDCA Plan, Recreation Element, p. 71).

The language on designation of specific routes for competition (“C” routes) is being updated in the CDCA Plan and being relocated from the Recreation Element to the MVA Access Element to be consistent with current Travel Management Guidance, and to consider route designations on a route-specific level, consistent with minimizing impacts per 43 CFR 8342.1 and the area-wide “limited” access designation that applies to routes in both MUC M and MUC L.

The 2006 WEMO Plan eliminated two of the three remaining long-distance race courses in the WEMO Planning area: the Barstow-to-Vegas motorcycle race course and the Johnson Valley to Stoddard Valley race course. The Johnson Valley to Parker Race Course was left in place. The availability of these race courses for competitive events would be reconsidered and modified in light of the current on-the-ground situation and the loss of acreage from the Johnson Valley OHV Open Area, and in reconsideration of all 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria.

PA VIII: Update Access Designations for Washes, Sand Dunes, and Dry Lakes

The 2006 WEMO Plan modified access parameters to allow motorized vehicle travel in washes only in those washes that are designated as “open routes” and signed as appropriate (2005 WEMO FEIS, p. 2-156). Previously use of washes was based on the MUC of the area within which they were located (CDCA Plan, 1999 rewrite, p. 78). This general approach is consistent with minimizing impacts per 43 CFR 8342.1 on a route-specific basis. Specific route designations for routes within washes are being considered within the context of the regulatory criteria.

Access on most dry lakes is subject to the access parameters of the surrounding lands. In limited areas within the WEMO Planning area, generally specific route designations would be identified for routes, including for routes across dry lakes. However, based on the unique geography of these areas, “routes of travel” cannot be readily delineated across many lakebeds. Therefore, many dry lakes within the CDCA, including in the WEMO Planning area are designated as either “open” or “closed” to vehicular travel regardless of the access parameters of the surrounding lands in which the lake beds are located. The lakebeds which were so identified are listed in Table 9 of the CDCA Plan, MVA Element (1999 reprint, p. 78). Since that time, the lakebeds in the Parish’s Daisy ACEC were “closed”. Four additional lakebeds are now be considered for lakebed-specific designations, based on changes in condition. The dry lakes are Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote (the one northeast of Calico lakebed), and Chisholm Trail (also northeast of Calico lakebed off of Chisholm Trail Road).

PA IX: Update Access Designations in the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Planning Area

The 2006 WEMO Plan adopted limitations on vehicle access into the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Area, by requiring a user education orientation program session developed in consultation with local jurisdictions and a permit to access this area. This was adopted as a trial measure to assess its effectiveness to minimize resource impacts in the area. Other measures implemented included substantial fencing on major through routes and restoration of non-designated routes. In the intervening years, the use of this strategy has come under review. Under this plan amendment, the permit system in the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Plan is being considered for elimination and replacement by alternative compliance strategies, based on operational experience.,

PA X: Modify Stopping and Parking Limitations

The CDCA Plan MVA Element specified that stopping, parking, and camping along routes of travel is limited to within 300 feet of the route. The 2006 WEMO Plan modified these parameters to further limit stopping and parking in DWMA, to within 50 feet of the route and camping within DWMA would need to occur adjacent to routes in previously disturbed areas. BLM is now considering alternatives that would allow the 300-foot planning area-wide limitation to be changed, and clarify camping limitations, to minimize impacts from the route network on a planning area-wide basis.

PA XI: Livestock Grazing Program Modifications in desert tortoise habitat

The 2006 WEMO Plan modified the CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing Element to provide for additional species conservation and desert tortoise recovery, by making livestock grazing unavailable or further restricting grazing in DWMA and other special status species habitat. Under this plan amendment, CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing Element would be further modified to provide for additional species conservation and desert tortoise recovery in DWMA, CHU, other desert tortoise habitat, and to enhance ecosystem functions.

2.1.3 Implementation-Level Decisions

LUP-level decisions establish the decision space for transportation access implementation decisions. Implementation-level strategies include the following:

- Activity plans for each TMA include;
 - Specific objectives, strategies, and priorities for action;
 - On-the-ground access upgrades or modifications other than route designations;
 - The adopted route network; and
 - Actions to implement all elements of the activity plans and of supporting implementation plans.
- Supporting implementation plans which may involve one or multiple activity plans, such as monitoring, law enforcement, and rehabilitation plans.
- Mechanisms for changes within the scope of the activity plan objectives.

The proposed transportation and travel network integrated into each of the activity plans will identify routes, trails, and primitive trails on public lands outside of OHV Open Areas that meet the goals and objectives of the LUP, consistent with 2006 WEMO Plan goals and objectives for the conservation of sensitive plant and animal species. The activity plans include the area-specific transportation networks and associated strategies for the management of access on public lands within the WEMO Planning area outside of OHV Open Areas. The specific motor-vehicle route network that is ultimately adopted in any specific area will depend on many factors, including the LUP framework and activity plan goals and objectives, feedback from the public and other interested parties, and the specific strategies selected to minimize impacts to 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria and to other resource values.

2.1.4 Process for Development of Transportation Network Alternatives

The WMRNP is being undertaken, in part, to complete the required Transportation and Travel Management (TTM) planning process for the WEMO Planning area.

As discussed in BLM's TTM Handbook (H-1342-1), every acre of BLM-managed public land must be designated as "Open", "Closed", or "Limited" Areas for OHV use. These area designations were made for the entire WEMO Planning Area in the CDCA Plan. As part of the planning area's TTM planning efforts, each individual transportation linear feature within that framework must also be designated as either:

- A Road, Primitive Road, or Trail that is part of the designated travel network; or
- Transportation Linear Disturbance (not part of the travel network).

Within the designated travel network, individual linear features are also further designated as either "Motorized", "Non-Motorized", or "Non-Mechanized". The travel network alternatives developed for evaluation in the WMRNP consist of different combinations of the "Motorized", "Non-Motorized", "Non-Mechanized", and "Transportation Linear Disturbance" designations, as needed to meet different access and resource protection objectives, as described in Section 2.2 above.

The required process in the TTM Handbook includes mandatory planning-level decisions, optional delineation of TMAs, and then implementation-level decisions, which can be made concurrent with the planning-level decisions, but must be completed within five years following the completion of the applicable LUP amendment. The general outline of the process is as follows:

- OHV Area Designations (mandatory planning-level decision);
- Identification of Travel Management Areas (optional planning-level decision);
- Designation of the travel management network consisting of roads, primitive roads, and trails (mandatory implementation-level decisions), and identification of other linear features as transportation linear disturbances.

In 43 CFR 8342.1, the preamble and the four components require designation of public lands and routes as open, limited, or closed based on protection of resources of the public lands, safety of all users, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of the public lands, and in accordance with the following designation criteria:

- a) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, air, or other resources of the public lands, and to prevent impairment of wilderness suitability.
- b) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Special attention will be given to protect endangered or threatened species and their habitats;
- c) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors.
- d) Areas and trails shall not be located in officially designated wilderness areas or primitive areas. Areas and trails shall be located in natural areas only if the authorized officer determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect natural, esthetic, scenic, or other values for which areas are established. (Note: "Natural areas" and "primitive areas" are not terms used by BLM and thus these factors do not apply).

The above criteria served as the basis for identifying resources to be considered and establishing thresholds to trigger measures to minimize impacts for each linear feature identified in the current inventory under each alternative. A detailed description of each step of the route designation process, including the current status and future plans, is provided in the subsections below.

OHV Area Designations

The designation of all acreage as Open, Limited, or Closed to OHV use is required as part of the Land Use Planning (LUP) process for each planning area. The CDCA Plan, which includes the WEMO Planning area, includes OHV area designations. No changes to these designations were proposed in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and none are being proposed in this current plan amendment effort.

Designation of Travel Management Areas

Designation of TMAs is an optional tool that BLM Field Offices can use to facilitate their overall TTM process. The designation of TMAs is a land use planning-level decision that must be addressed in the applicable LUP or amendment, which in this case would be an amendment to the 2006 WEMO Plan and Elements of the CDCA Plan for the WEMO Planning Area.

In the WEMO Planning Area, the feasibility of establishing TMAs and using them to facilitate TTM planning was evaluated as a result of the scoping process. Following the initial scoping meeting in September 2011, BLM held eight travel designation workshops within the identified TMAs, with the intention of conducting additional scoping that focused on the particular uses, resource issues, and areas of controversy that are specific to each TMA.

One purpose of the current planning effort is to establish TMAs as part of the Motorized Vehicle Access Element of the CDCA Plan. The BLM has identified three Alternatives related to establishment of TMAs, including:

- Alternative 1: No Action, which would include no TMAs being established;

- Alternatives 2 and 3: Establishment of eight TMAs, as developed during the scoping process; and
- Alternative 4: Establishment of nine TMAs, based on additional analysis following the scoping period.

Identification of Sub-Regions

Similar to the designation of TMAs, the BLM's evaluation of public comments received during the scoping process led to the definition of sub-regions that were later used to facilitate the analysis of impacts and identification of route network alternatives. As the public comments were analyzed to identify issues, common issues were found to be grouped geographically based on proximity to population centers, topographical and geologic setting, presence of sensitive resources, historical land uses, and other characteristics. These areas were found to be similar to the geographic boundaries used by BLM's rangers to facilitate law enforcement efforts, and comprise 36 sub-regions throughout the WEMO Planning area. Based on the issues and similarity to BLM's law enforcement boundaries, BLM staff chose to evaluate the existing route network and develop route network alternatives on a sub-region basis. The 36 sub-regions are defined in Table 2.1-3, and shown on Figure 2.1-1.

There are some distinct differences in the establishment of TMA's and sub-regions. TMAs are planning decisions used to establish common objectives and coordinate management actions throughout an area. The sub-regions were used as a tool to facilitate resource-specific analysis, but were not intended to act as administrative units for establishing land use planning objectives and coordinating management actions.

Table 2.1-3. Summary of WEMO Planning Area Subregions Used to Support the Route Network Analysis and Development of Draft Implementation Strategies

Sub-Region	Indicator on Maps	General Location
Broadwell	BL	South third of proposed TMA 1, bounded by Highway 40 on south, Tonapah & Tidewater RR on the east, Newberry Springs to west, Hidden Valley Rd to north.
Afton	AC	North third of proposed TMA 1, bounded by Interstate 15 on north, Hidden Valley Rd on south, Preserve/T&T east boundary, Newberry Springs west boundary.
Barstow	BA	West third of proposed TMA 1; directly east of Barstow, north boundary Hwy 15, south boundary Hwy 40. Majority land private, mixed development, military base, railroad, agriculture.
Darwin	DA	Northern end of proposed TMA 2, bounded by Hwy. 190 on the north, Death Valley NP on the east, China Lake NWS on the south, and Coso Range Wilderness on the west.
Sierra	SI	Western half of proposed TMA 2, bounded by CDCA boundary and Hwy. 190 on the north, China Lake and Darwin Sub-region on the east, Hwy 178 on the south, and the Inyo NF and CDCA boundary on the west.

Table 2.1-3. Summary of WEMO Planning Area Subregions Used to Support the Route Network Analysis and Development of Draft Implementation Strategies

Sub-Region	Indicator on Maps	General Location
North Searles	NS	Northeastern end of proposed TMA 2, bounded by the Slate Range Crossing on the north, the ridge top of the Slate Range separating Searles Valley from Panamint Valley on the east, Township line 26S on the South, and China Lake NWS on the west.
South Searles	SS	Southeastern end of proposed TMA 2, bounded along Township line 26S on the north, China Lake NWS on the east, Randsburg Wash Road on the south, and China Lake NWS on the west.
Joshua Tree	JT	Southeastern most portion of BFO; dry desert lands rise to the south from Highway 62. Joshua Tree NP. South boundary west is 247.
Wonder Valley	WV	North east third of proposed TMA 3, open valley, lightly scattered residential; between Hwy 62 & 29 Palms Marine Base
Rattlesnake Canyon	RC	South center field office; desert uplands around east-northeast base of San Bernardino Mountains. West boundary is Hwy18.
Juniper Flats	JF	Southwest corner BFO; borders Hwy18 on east, SBNF to south, Mojave River on west & Hwy 247 to north.
Morongo Valley	MV	Center-southernmost portion of BFO, centered around town of Morongo Valley; area at eastern base of San Bernardino Mountains, between San Gorgonio Wilderness & PSC.
Needles South	NE	Northwest corner of NFO. N boundary Route 66 & Hwy40, S boundary Cleghorn Lakes Wilderness; W boundary 29 Palms Marine Base, E boundary Amboy Rd.
Pisgah Crater	PC	Center east portion of BFO. S boundary is 29 Palms Marine Base, boundary I40; W boundary is Powerline Rd., E boundary 2.5 miles west of Ludlow.
Jawbone	JB	Northern end of proposed TMA 4, bounded by Hwy 178 on the north, Hwy 14 on the east, Township line 31S on the south, and the CDCA boundary on the west.
Middle Knob	MK	Central section of proposed TMA 4, bounded by Township line 31S on the north, Hwy 14 on the east, Kern and Los Angeles county lines on the south, and the CDCA boundary on the west.
Lancaster	LA	Southern area of proposed TMA 4, bounded by Highway 58 on the north, San Bernardino county line on the east, Angeles NF on the south, and the CDCA boundary on the west.
Fremont Peak	FP	Northwest corner of BFO; N boundary Ridgecrest OF, W boundary Hwy395, S boundary Hwy58 & BNSF, E boundary Harper dry lake.
Black Mountain	BM	Northwest portion, east of and similar to Fremont peak. N boundary Ridgecrest, China Lake, W boundary Fremont Peak, S boundary Hwy 58 & BNSF, E boundary Coolgardie
Harper Lake	HL	North central portion of proposed TMA 5. Wide expansive open valleys, low hills, Harper dry lake.
Coolgardie	CG	Also north central portion proposed TMA 5. Softer & rounded landscape, between Ft Irwin to north & City of Barstow to south; Calico to east & Black Mountain to west.
Mitchel Mountains	MM	Center of BFO, south center portion of proposed TMA 5. Small pocket of low rugged mountains border north side of Barstow City.

Table 2.1-3. Summary of WEMO Planning Area Subregions Used to Support the Route Network Analysis and Development of Draft Implementation Strategies

Sub-Region	Indicator on Maps	General Location
Calico Mountains	CM	Central portion of proposed TMA 5. Borders I15 on south, Ft. Irwin Rd to west & north, Alvord Mountains to east.
Cronese Lake	CL	North eastern portion of proposed TMA 5. Borders I15 on south, Ft. Irwin to north; west from Coyote Dry Lake east to almost Baker.
Edwards Bowl	EM	Pocket area north of El Mirage, west of Hwy395, east of LA county & south of Edwards.
Kramer Hills	KH	West center portion of BFO and center of proposed TMA 6. West boundary is Hwy395 & east is Helendale Rd; north boundary is Hwy59 & south boundary is Silver Lakes.
Victorville	VV	Area west of the Mojave River, and east of the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County boundary.
Iron Mountain	IM	Area south of Hwy58, east of Helendale, and north of Route 66.
Ridgecrest	RI	Northeastern portion of proposed TMA 7, including the community of Ridgecrest, bounded by China Lake NWS on the north and east, Golden Valley Wilderness on the south, and Hwy 395 on the west.
El Paso	EP	Northwestern portion of proposed TMA 7, bounded by Hwy 178 on the north, Hwy 395 on the east, Garlock and Redrock-Randsburg Road on the south and Hwy 14 on the west.
Rand	RA	Southwestern portion of proposed TMA 7, bounded by Garlock and Redrock-Randsburg Road on the north, Hwy 395 and the Kern/ San Bernardino county line on the east, Hwy 58 on the south, and Hwy 14 on the west
Red Mountain	RM	Southeastern portion of proposed TMA 7, bounded by Golden Valley Wilderness and Township line 29S on the north, China Lake NWS on the east, Cuddeback Lake Road, Hwy's 395 and 58 on the south, and the Kern/San Bernardino county line on the west.
Stoddard Valley	SV	Area between Victorville & Barstow, south of Hwy15; east boundary Hwy247, west boundary Mojave River.
Ord Mountains	OM	Nearly geographical center of field office, center north of TMA. West boundary Hwy247, east boundary Camp Rock Rd, north boundary I40 & Bartow, south is Lucerne Valley
Newberry Rodman	NR	TMA south of Hwy40 and north of Johnson Valley OHV Area; Camp Rock Rd is the west & SW boundary; east & NE boundary is powerline.
Johnson Valley	JV	Most of TMA includes Johnson Valley OHV Area and public lands as far south and west as Hwy247.

Designation of Travel Network

Implementation-level decisions include the designation of individual roads, primitive roads, and trails as part of the designated travel network, as well as designation of transportation linear disturbances. Roads, primitive roads, and trails to be included in the network would include motorized, non-motorized, and non-mechanized routes. Also, non-mechanized routes in wilderness or other OHV Closed Areas may be included in the network, consistent with current wilderness policies, plans, and minimum tool standards. Travel management plan decisions will

ultimately identify selection of management prescriptions for individual routes in the network, including signage; speed limits; stopping and parking restrictions; or restrictions based on season, time of day, or weather.

The history of route designations in the WEMO Planning area was discussed briefly in Chapter 1 and is further discussed in Appendix E. Route designations that were evaluated and adopted in the 2003 Environmental Assessment for the Western Mojave Desert Off Road Vehicle Designation Project were the starting point for the analysis in 2006 WEMO Plan, and the adopted 2003 network, with some modifications as a result of public comment on the 2003 WEMO Plan DEIS, are proposed and analyzed in the 2005 WEMO Plan FEIS. The 2006 WEMO Plan ROD approved the FEIS route designations, with some minor modifications. The 2006 WEMO ROD was vacated by the Court's Summary Judgment order, which required BLM to reconsider the route designations, consistent with the 43 CFR 8342.1 regulations.

In response, BLM has re-developed the route designation process in accordance with the TTM Handbook. The BLM implemented the following steps to assure a coherent network that includes route minimization:

A. Conduct Inventory and Establish the Baseline

- The initial basis of the route network inventory was the 2006 WEMO Plan inventory, as corrected per the errata maps ordered by the Court, and provided by BLM.
- This initial inventory was from multiple sources, and its accuracy and completeness varied depending upon the source. BLM then updated the inventory of linear features by reviewing existing features and tracing additional features from USDA's one meter-resolution National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) aerial photography into the Ground Transportation Linear Features (GTLF) geospatial database. The inventory consisted of the 2006 WEMO Plan network (as corrected and adjusted by the Court), which serves as the No Action Alternative, and other linear features that currently exist on the ground, to ensure that all existing features were included in the analysis. Note that this inventory reflects the on-the-ground features existing as of 2013¹, and thus includes features that were developed after 1980. It also reflects substantial improvement in technical accuracy—many of the previously unrecognized features are simply the result of better photography since 1980 and were not detected at that time, and many others are the result of subsequent land acquisitions and permitting activities.
- This data was checked against field surveys in 2012 conducted to sign and monitor the open route network.
- The 2012-2013 inventory is intended to include all routes that still have some evidence of recent past or current use. Some routes may be included where recent use no longer is evident as a result of active or passive reclamation, and the inventory will be updated as new on-the-ground information confirms use levels. A sample review of earlier (2005) and later (2013) aerial photographs indicates that the inventory represents a combination of previously known and undocumented routes that have

¹ Aerial data is from 2009, and on the ground data is from 2012 and 2013. Aerial data will be updated once after the Draft Plan is released.

been on-the-ground for at least the last 8 years, and the inventory is relatively stable (See Appendix E).

- The BLM identified and collected existing resource data, in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) format, to be considered based on the requirements of 43 CFR 8342.1, the Court's Summary Judgment and Remedy Order, and scoping comments.

B. Document Analytical Process

- BLM developed an Access database that was used to document the potential route segment baseline, the resources associated with each route segment, the preliminary route network recommendations resulting from application of the threshold analysis using GIS, the public input and other non-GIS information captured for each route segment, and the rationale for the final staff recommendations for each preliminary alternative (e.g., documenting instances where professional judgement or other route-specific or resource-specific information may have overridden the GIS based analysis).
- Once alternative development was complete, the Access database was used to generate an analysis of impacts from the route network under each alternative to 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria and non-criteria resource values.
- The Access database facilitates review of the coincidence between a route segment and one or more potential resources to clarify or quantify that coincidence, allows entering additional known route use or resource information that may affect the route network recommendation, and provides for the assignment of specific minimization and mitigation for each route segment within each alternative, and modification of the preliminary GIS-developed recommendation, where appropriate.
- This database is used to document adjustments to specific routes in the network based on identification and analysis of new issues and needs.

C. Identify Mechanisms to Use for Alternative Development

- The BLM identified the No Action Alternative, which, based on the Remedy Order, is the route network currently in use until a revised network is approved.
- The BLM identified specific resource values (e.g. riparian areas) that could adequately identify potential resource impacts based on the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria associated with the network and with individual routes and linear features.
- The Network-wide minimization strategies were identified for each alternative. The specific parameters for the following were elements of these strategies:
 - Stopping, parking and camping parameters were modified, specific to each alternative, and used to minimize impacts and focus the remaining impacts from criteria resources.
 - The approach to routes that had been designated as "Closed" in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision was determined for each alternative, subject to route-specific review.
 - The approach to routes which were undesignated in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision (i.e., features that were added in 2013 as a result of the GTLF inventory update and

the on-the-ground signing and monitoring process) was determined for each alternative, subject to route-specific review.

- The approach to competitive-event routes outside of OHV Open area.
- The approach to designated parking, staging and camping areas in sensitive locations.
- Staff identified preliminary resource thresholds that would identify the potential need for minimization strategies and mitigation of resource impacts on the network and on each specific route segment (referred to herein as minimization strategies and mitigation measures), for criteria in 43 CFR 8342.1, considering the network strategies. Some of the thresholds were based on a distance between the route and the resource (e.g. route within 50 feet of a riparian area), while others were based on co-location of any portion of the route with a resource (e.g., route within a desert wash). In most cases, the comparison of the route to the resource was based on a GIS analysis. In cases where the resource data were not available in GIS, such as tribal areas, the comparison was done based on the resource specialists' working knowledge of the local area, supplemented with additional field visits and tribal consultations, as needed.
- The BLM developed objectives to be considered as part of the framework for the route network alternatives.
- BLM adjusted the thresholds by alternative, reflective of the objectives and the specific network thresholds for each alternative.

D. Issues and Assumptions Used to Develop Alternatives

- All action alternatives utilize the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria, as well as factoring in the issues of network connectivity, pertinent resource issues not identified in the 43 CFR criteria, and information on the use of the network and of specific routes, including information provided by the public.
- The specific initial minimization strategies and mitigation responses in each alternative vary, and the threshold for closure as the initial minimization strategy, is lower for Alternative 2 (closure is more readily triggered) than in Alternative 3 (closure is less readily triggered with mitigation more readily triggered). In Alternative 4, the selection of either initial minimization through closure or other mitigation measures, as a response to conflicts was more sensitive to existing uses and needs.
- Minimization strategies and mitigation measures fall into three categories: (1) network; (2) network and site or use-specific; and (3) designation changes to a route segment or entire route.
- Network minimization strategies minimize impacts of the network on a network-wide basis. Identifying some of these at the outset of the process helped focus other potential minimization and mitigation.
- The site- and use-specific mitigation responses were, and included a range of mitigation actions, depending on the sensitivity and location of the conflict. These are outlined in Section 2.3. Site-specific evaluation was sometimes necessary to further clarify appropriate strategies.

- Designation changes to minimize impacts included route closure or further limitation of motorized and other uses of a route, by vehicle or other travel type, by who would be able to use the route, or by season of use. These terms are defined in the glossary. For the purposes of this analysis, the following assumptions were made with respect to vehicle use:
 - Narrower routes (single-track motorcycle), then quad routes, are considered less impacting than 4-wheel drive routes;
 - Two-wheel drive improved routes are considered less impacting than 4-wheel drive routes, other factors being equal;
 - Non-motorized routes and primitive trails (in Wilderness Study Areas) are considered less impacting than motorized routes;
 - Non-mechanized routes are considered less impacting than non-motorized routes; and
 - Hiking routes are considered less impacting than non-motorized routes and primitive trails.
- Also, the following assumptions were made with respect to users:
 - General public use routes are less impacting than competitive event routes and competitive event corridor routes;
 - Authorized user routes are generally less impacting than routes open to the public;
 - Administrative user routes are less impacting than either authorized or public-use routes; and
 - Seasonal routes are less impacting than motorized routes and may be less impacting than other routes and trails.
- Finally, an assumption was made that limiting access to a class of routes not previously available to the public and that would not affect overall network continuity and accessibility, is one reasonable network-wide minimization strategy, whether or not a specific route or route-segment triggered a site-specific review for minimization under the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria. This assumption is based on the objectives of each alternative, and taking a regional approach to minimizing impacts and developing mitigation or conservation measures for the planning area. Limiting access to a class of routes leads to long-term reduction of disturbed lands and surfaces in the desert, so to enhanced natural communities and habitat continuity, to improved watersheds, and to improved air quality in a non-attainment area; other benefits may accrue by minimizing cumulative effects to resources that are based on the relationship of many impacts to the number of route miles, as discussed in Chapter 4. Therefore, class-wide minimization strategies are appropriate to apply to undocumented routes that were not included in the 2001-2002 (or other, e.g., 1985-1987) inventories or which were already closed or limited in the 2006 WEMO Plan under one or more alternatives. Under all alternatives, additional route-specific mitigation measures that are selected are reflective of the degree of conflict.

E. Summary of the Alternative Development

The minimization triggers and strategies that were developed by alternative are included in the alternative-specific discussions (see sections 2.3 and 2.4).

1. The most current resources data was overlain on the 2013 inventoried routes to create a computer-generated Geographic Information Systems (GIS) layer and BLM ran a comparative GIS analysis of the inventoried route segments to identify specific locations of potential resource impacts, based on preliminary network wide and resource-specific minimization triggers.
2. Three levels of network-wide measures were identified to focus and minimize impacts, depending upon the alternative: a) No Action; b) Alternative 2; and c) Alternatives 3/4.
3. BLM staff reviewed the results of the GIS analysis and other resource comparisons to assure that the thresholds would adequately identify relative impacts to sensitive resources, adjusted accordingly, and ran the analysis again integrating the various network-wide and resource-specific potential parameters to identify sensitive impacts, and to identify potential approaches to distinguish responses to the impacts.
4. Based on the types of impacts to sensitive resources, route-specific conflicts with the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria, the objectives of the each alternative, and the overall resource goals of the WEMO Planning area, the BLM refined the preliminary triggers to establish the framework for identification of the initial route network alternatives that would incorporate standard minimization strategies (e.g., closures and route limitations) and also identify routes that may need additional mitigation measures or other minimization strategies.
5. For Alternatives 2 and 3, a preliminary alternative was then generated through the GIS exercise that included initial assignment of a preliminary designation and sub-designation of each route segment based on resource impacts. Maps of each of the subregion networks in a particular travel management area for each of the alternatives were generated. These maps were integrated with additional resource, recreational, and other information to provide context for the route-specific review and development of the alternative.
 - Each feature was then reviewed and additional site-specific information applied. In addition, the level of conflicts and issues was assessed.
 - Initial Connectivity Needs were identified where the thresholds result in routes with some route segments recommended for closure and other segments recommended to stay open.
 - Conflicts in use were identified where the resulting preliminary alternative results in routes where one or more of the alternative objectives would recommend consideration of different approaches to minimization and mitigation.
 - Conflicts in analysis were identified where the resulting preliminary alternative results in a route segments that include different approaches to minimization and mitigation.
 - Connectivity issues and conflicts were addressed based on the relative sensitivity of affected resources, known uses and needs of the route segment, the objectives of the

alternative, additional resource and recreation goals for the area, where identified, and other information from staff, other agencies, and the public, to determine if a feature is included within the alternative travel network as “Motorized”, Non-mechanized, Non-motorized, or else closed and classified as a Transportation Linear Disturbance, and any appropriate additional mitigation measures are identified.

- Specific mitigation strategies were identified by resource, as needed.
6. BLM staff then began the development of the alternative from the preliminary GIS alternative. The maps with the initial designations were reviewed by BLM staff, and adjusted based on the identified conflicts and issues, public or other agency input, site-specific knowledge, and to ensure that the network would be complete and link to adjacent subregions seamlessly to create a travel management area network.
 7. For No Action and Alternative 4, Steps 6 and 5 were reversed in order. BLM began with the No Action alternative. The No Action alternative was adjusted only to correct errors and add known rights-of-ways that had been overlooked. Alternative 4 was then developed from the No Action alternative, as corrected. Alternative 4 factored in additional site-specific knowledge, conflicts and issues, public input from scoping and from the subsequent WMRNP Desert Advisory Council (DAC) Subgroup recommendations to the BLM District Manager (the reports are posted on the DAC website at <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/info/rac/dac/wmrnp.html>), and input from other agencies and from staff, to develop the preliminary Alternative 4 network. Then, as with alternatives 2 and 3, a GIS exercise generated maps in each subregion within a travel management area that showed remaining areas of conflict. The GIS exercise was used for No Action to identify remaining conflicts and issues as well, as a basis of comparison with the other alternatives. No changes were made. Alternative 4 maps indicated which of the preliminary routes and route-segments in the initial Alternative 4 would need site-specific review for additional minimization strategies (closure or use limitation) and mitigation measures, and other route options to address unmet needs and continuity of the network where conflicts had been identified.
 8. The preliminary identification of a route under all alternatives was modified to (1) complete the network, (2) ensure inclusion of authorized rights-of-way that were known, (3) based on other staff or public input, and (4) based on level of sensitivities. Where conflicts were identified during these changes, additional minimization strategies or mitigation measures could be identified for the route. Where sensitivities were known not to exist (false positives) or to be less problematic than the GIS indicated, routes may have been opened.
 9. Input on specific types of uses other than motorized use was taken into consideration in development of the alternatives, including non-motorized and non-mechanized trails, and motorcycle routes. One or more alternatives may have been adjusted, based on the overall goals of each alternative, to provide a reasonable range of alternatives for routes that are particularly sensitive, in consideration of network continuity, in consideration of different resource values, or for routes that received a wide range of feedback from the public during scoping.

10. For routes ending at a jurisdictional boundary or private property, the following preliminary designations would generally be made, subject to agency consultation, the need for a reasonable range of alternatives, and potential mitigation measures:
 - For the Department of Defense, the route would be identified as a transportation linear disturbance (closed) from the last intersection, unless the route leads to an official gated access.
 - For the National Park Service, US Forest Service, California Parks, or California Fish and Wildlife, route access would be matched to the corresponding designation by the other jurisdiction, unless further minimized based on the designation criteria, or provided site-specific input from the agency. For example if the route on US Forest Service land was motorized, BLM would allow for connection by identifying the route as motorized, or, if for an authorization, limited. Otherwise, the route would be identified as a transportation linear disturbance (closed) from the last intersection.
 - For a route entering private property or land of the California State Lands Commission, the route would be designated as motorized to allow for access to the private parcel, to the extent feasible with current network, consistent with a review of the designation criteria. If the property boundary was known to be fenced, or information was available that BLM was contacted by owner to not provide access, the route was designated as a transportation linear disturbance (closed) from the last intersection, consistent with network connectivity in at least one alternative, consistent with the criteria.
 - For a route that runs adjacent to other jurisdictions or private property, no specific approach was taken. These routes were addressed based on site-specific factors and the objectives of each alternative.
 - For a route which intersects a national designated trail, if the route provides access to a trailhead, it was identified as motorized, unless there is no parking or staging area or the route is located a distance from the designated trail, consistent with the designation criteria. If the route conflicts with trail use, such as traveling parallel to the trail, then it was generally identified as a transportation linear disturbance (closed). These designations may be adjusted in the FSEIS, to achieve consistency with the draft DRECP Plan setbacks from designated trails (see <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/prog/energy/DRECP/policy.html>).
11. After the route-specific review, these administrative draft alternative designations went through a preliminary impact analysis process and additional adjustments may have been made based on the results of the initial analysis of impacts and the overall goals of the alternative.
12. The results of the analysis are documented in an Access Table by route or route segment, referred to as WEMO ID. These WEMO IDs were used to break apart routes between intersections and where potential changes in resource conflicts changed to provide more site-specificity in identifying conflicts, identifying resource specific mitigation measures, and more flexibility during the alternative development process. Each WEMO ID is cross-referenced back to the route name, and includes data on the

route, and for each alternative who inputted data, how the route is being used, resource conflicts, recreational assets, public comments, the alternative designation (transportation and travel uses) under the alternative, and whether mitigation measures are identified.

F. Alternatives in the Draft Supplemental EIS

- The results of this process were used to generate administrative draft alternative maps, and reviewed to verify that the resulting route network within each alternative was viable, meet the objectives of the alternative, and was consistent with the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria, the goals and objectives of the CDCA Plan, as modified herein, and the additional goals and objectives of the 2006 WEMO Plan.
- Adjustments were made in highly sensitive areas based on issues that were not identified through the GIS analysis and preliminary review.
- Management reviewed staff recommendations, made adjustments to alternatives, and selected the preferred alternative.

The result of this process has been the development of different route networks that include the current route network (Alternative 1, or the No Action Alternative), and a network that achieved the objectives of the Resource Conservation Enhancement Alternative (Alternative 2), a Public Lands Access Alternative (Alternative 3), and a Community Access Alternative (Alternative 4).

Resource-Specific Minimization Strategies and Mitigation Measures

The BLM developed potential network-wide minimization and mitigation which varied based on the alternative-specific objectives. The network-wide strategies addressed area and route-specific impacts, and were the first response to the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria to minimize impacts in the designation of routes, whether or not additional route-specific measures would be applied. The network-wide strategies are outlined under each alternative in Section 2.3.

Table 2.1-4, below, provides a list of resource-specific concerns and has site and/or route specific measures that may be implemented on a case-by-case basis as determined appropriate by the BLM, in lieu of route closure, other use limitation, or network-wide minimization strategies, and in addition to signing and route maintenance, where appropriate. These would apply for route segments designated as open with minimization and mitigation. The mitigation actions listed below are examples of potential actions that may be taken when determined appropriate for the particular location and resource/concern that is present along with determined cause(s). The mitigation measure(s) employed will be based on a case-by case analysis, based on the strategies in the travel management plans. This is not a comprehensive list and additional adaptive management actions may be implemented as needed to address conflicts as they occur or increase, and based on changing use patterns. The specific measure(s) employed may require additional site evaluation, and are included in the Access Table as they are identified. The Access Table can also be used to track their completion.

In addition to these actions, the BLM will continue to monitor the WEMO Plan Area and as additional information becomes available, the BLM will continue to evaluate the designated road and travel network to ensure it continues to meet the objectives of 43 CFR 8340, the applicable land use plan goals and objectives, the pertinent travel management plan, and applicable laws

and regulations. Route designations or minimization and mitigation actions in this plan could be modified based on monitoring results, or to accommodate land use proposals, following the appropriate analysis under NEPA.

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Soil Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select alternative route to minimize off-route disturbance; • Implement seasonal restrictions, designated as motorized only by permit, or designate closure under certain conditions (such as when route is wet); • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices, Re-align route to minimize impact to environmentally sensitive area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers or fencing; • Narrow the route; • Construct and/or Install Educational information such as signs; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts, and • Determine that no additional site-specific minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on area or site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to direct use to areas with a lower impact; • Harden access route; • Apply water or similar application during high use periods; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices; • Install signs; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on area or site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting or more controlled designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Construct and/or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install speed bumps or similar mechanisms to slow traffic through an area, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on area or site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Cultural Resources – including Tribal Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Prohibit Special Recreation Permit use; • Remove Attractants; • Construct and/or Install Educational information such as signs or kiosks; • Install step-overs; • Narrow route for cultural concerns; • Fencing or enclosure of a cultural resource; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive area, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on feature or site evaluation pursuant to 36 CFR 60 • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on field identification (i.e ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource is present, no resources are impacted or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Grazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install gates; • Install fencing; • Install Signs; • Install barriers and maintain existing barriers; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install tortoise friendly cattle guards; and • Determination that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediate abandoned mine land features or other safety hazards; • Install fencing; • Install Signs; • Temporarily close routes while safety issues are addressed; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Limit Special Recreation Permitted Use; • Remove Attractants; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive area, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Lands inventoried for wilderness characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Attractants; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Prohibit Special Recreation Permit Use; • Install Signs; • Install barriers; • Maintain existing barriers; • Install step-overs; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Tortoise Habitat - DWMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install Wildlife Bypass; • Install Wildlife Safety Zone signs; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Seasonal Use Restriction; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid designated area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Maintain berms so that they do not adversely impact the movement of desert tortoise; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determination that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Riparian Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitate disturbance; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking area; • Install barriers and maintain existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Install Educational Construct such as installing signs; • Install step-over; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices; • Harden water crossing; • Seasonal closure during bird nesting season; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Protected Vegetation Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install step-over; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate) .

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Protected Wildlife Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Wildlife Bypass; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add Install barriers; • Maintain existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Seasonal use restriction; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Desert washes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Install barriers and maintain existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install step-over; • Install fencing; • Seasonal or complete closure; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Golden Eagles – active nests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal closure during nesting season; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Install barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Mohave Ground Squirrel - core areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Wildlife Bypass; • Install Wildlife Safety Zone signs; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid designated area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource, and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Wildlife Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Wildlife Bypass; • Install Wildlife Safety Zone signs; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid designated area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Maintain berms so that they do not adversely impact the movement of desert tortoise; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on area evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Springs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking area; • Add or modify hiking trail access; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install step-over; • Install barriers; • Narrow route; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices; • Seasonal closure during bird nesting season; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Rare and Special Status Plant Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid environmentally sensitive area; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install step-over; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Install/Implement Erosion Prevention Best Management Practices; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).

Table 2.1-4. Potential Resource-Specific Minimization and Mitigation Actions

Resource Concern	Possible Minimization and Mitigation Action(s)
Multiple User Conflicts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Minimize overlapping uses by separating in time or space, or through a permitting mechanism; • Add or identify alternative non-motorized or non-mechanized trail access; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs; • Install step-over; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate).
Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) Class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Install/Utilize features to reduce visual impact; • Remove Attractants; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate) .
ACEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Re-align route to avoid designated area; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Add/Upgrade parking/camping area; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Add or modify non-motorized trail access; • Remove Attractants; • Construct or Install Educational information such as signs and kiosks; • Install fencing; • Narrow route; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate) .
Wilderness Study Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify access to a less impacting designation; • Limit the route to lower intensity use or prohibit Special Recreation Permitted use; • Install access type restrictor; • Restrict stopping/parking/camping; • Install barriers and maintain or upgrade existing barriers; • Remove Attractants; • Monitor the route for signs of increasing impacts to a sensitive resource; and • Determine that no additional minimization and mitigation measure is needed based on site evaluation (i.e., ground truthing of GIS data indicates no resource impact or existing minimization and mitigation is adequate) .

2.2 Land-Use Planning Alternatives

As discussed in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, each of the alternatives is composed of LUP-level decisions and implementation-level decisions. Implementation-level alternatives are outlined in Section 2.3 of this Chapter. Section 2.2 outlines plan-level goals and objectives for each alternative, which are plan-level decisions, and include both travel management and grazing program management. Network-wide travel management mitigation strategies may also be plan-level decisions, if they related to stopping, camping and parking, wash routes, and lakebeds. Although these are plan-level decisions in the CDCA, including the West Mojave Planning area, as they cover the entire planning area, they are reiterated in Section 2.3, because they can also be site-specific implementation decisions. They also provide one of the key minimization strategies for potential impacts from the route network. The Agency Preferred Land-Use Planning Alternative for both travel management and grazing management in the Draft SEIS is Alternative 3.

2.2.1 Land-Use Planning (LUP) Goals

General LUP Goals and Objectives Common to all Alternatives

All alternatives incorporate the CDCA Plan goal to provide for the use and access to public lands, and resources within the CDCA, including economic, educational, scientific, and recreational uses, in a manner which enhances, wherever possible—and which does not diminish, on balance—the environmental, cultural and aesthetic values of the desert and of its productivity, as identified in Sections 601 and 103 of FLPMA. The CDCA Plan recognized the sometimes complex and conflicting mandates that provide for both use and protection of a variety of public resources, and the key role of access across public lands. The Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the Plan provides the overarching guidance for motor vehicle access for the entire CDCA, including the WEMO Planning area, to provide a system and set of rules governing access.

The adopted framework to update the MVA Element and specific travel management strategies would (1) limit conflicts and threats to sensitive resources, (2) respond to current and anticipated future transportation and travel needs, (3) provide appropriate recreational access, and (4) are consistent with the overall motor vehicle access goal of the 2006 WEMO Plan.

The Livestock Grazing Element of the CDCA Plan also provides overarching guidance. The goals of the CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing Element are to:

1. Use range management to maintain or improve vegetation to meet livestock needs and to meet other management needs set forth in the Plan.
2. Continue the use of the California Desert for livestock production to contribute to satisfying the need for food and fiber from public land.
3. Maintain good and excellent range condition and improve poor and fair range condition by one condition class through development and implementation of feasible grazing systems or Allotment Management Plans (AMPs). Adjust livestock use where monitoring data indicate changes are necessary to meet resource objectives.

The CDCA Plan also analyzed seven alternatives with respect to the number of livestock allotments, the livestock to be grazed on each allotment, the type of allotment (perennial,

ephemeral, or a combination), the amount of forage in each allotment dedicated to livestock, to wildlife, and to wild horses and burros, and the resulting livestock carrying capacity.

Key changes to the CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing Element made in the 2006 WEMO Plan (see pages 2-131-133 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS) include:

1. Adopt Regional Standards and Guidelines for the management of the grazing program. The adoption of Regional Standards and Guidelines are dependent upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior.
2. Make the majority of ephemeral sheep/cattle grazing allotments in DWMA unavailable for grazing use, to include: Portions of the Buckhorn Canyon, East and West Stoddard, and Monolith-Cantil Allotments, and the entire Gravel Hills, Superior Valley and Goldstone Allotments.
3. Discontinue ephemeral grazing within cattle grazing allotments when forage is below 230 lbs. per acre (a change from the CDCA Plan 200 lbs. per acre threshold);
4. Discontinue the use of ephemeral grazing and temporary non-renewable grazing authorization within cattle grazing allotments located in DWMA;
5. Provide for voluntarily relinquishment of allotments located in DWMA and other special status species habitat, and, upon relinquishment, make such allotments unavailable for grazing.
6. Manage grazing in remaining active allotments consistent with the CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing Element goals and planning objectives adopted in the 2006 WEMO Plan, including additional objectives for management of grazing in active allotments within DWMA and CHU, unless and until the specific allotments are proposed for change through plan amendment, either in this document or through future amendment.

These program strategies would apply under all alternatives. Changes proposed under action alternatives affect specific allotments under the various alternatives based on their status as active or inactive, and allotment boundary overlap with DWMA and CHU boundaries.

In addition, the following legislative changes were made subsequent to the 2006 WEMO Plan that would be incorporated under all alternatives to conform the CDCA Plan, as amended:

- Permanent relinquishment of the Lava Mountain and the Walker Pass Common Allotments' preference, elimination of grazing and reallocation of the AUMs in these two allotments from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions under the authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act (Public Law 112-74).

All alternatives also recognize BLM's goals for National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) areas. Facilities, including roads and range improvements, are only developed in sensitive areas where they are required for public health and safety, are necessary for the exercise of valid existing rights, minimize impacts to sensitive resources, or further the multiple use, sustained yield purposes for which the area was designated. New roads and facilities are evaluated and approved in the context of specific access needs and allotment plans rather than as an element of the overall land-use planning strategy for one or more alternatives.

General LUP Goals and Objectives Common to all Action Alternatives

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 also propose to resolve access management conflicts between the 2006 WEMO Plan and the CDCA Plan, to meet the goals and objectives of the TTM process in the West Mojave to create travel networks that are logical and sustainable, to meet the increasingly diverse transportation, access, and recreational needs of the public in the context of the framework of FLPMA, and to address issues identified by the Court in its 2009 Summary Judgment and summarized in its 2011 Remedy Order (January 28, 2011, p.3-4).

All action alternatives incorporate the WMRNP purpose and need stated in Chapter 1 to update the MVA Element system and rules in Limited Access areas within the West Mojave Planning Area. These requirements reflect the broad scope and integration of transportation management, recognize appropriate levels of planning and types of uses covered, identify implementation decisions that can be made under this guidance, and capture the constraints specific to the planning area. To accomplish this, objectives include adopting additional transportation-specific broad scale interdisciplinary LUP-level planning decisions, developing specific Activity or Area Plans, and identifying specific implementation strategies in the Activity or Area Plans, or that are consistent with and tier from these plans in the future. Each action alternative would have the same general travel management goals and objectives, as follows:

- Provide reasonable, safe, and environmentally sound access for visitors, local residents, licensed and permitted activities, and property owners through coordination and collaboration on travel systems with other agencies, state and local governments and interested stakeholders;
- Maintain an accurate database of both open and closed routes for management purposes;
- Maintain a system that updates route designations as new decisions are made, for the production of current general, resource-specific, and user or recreation-specific Transportation Management Network maps;
- Manage OHV use to protect environmental and cultural resources, promote public safety, and provide OHV opportunities;
- Designate areas and routes where various types of OHVs are permitted or prohibited; and
- Adopt implementation plans to manage the route network and respond to changing conditions. Specific updates to implementation plans would be included as part of the Transportation Management Plans, if appropriate.

2.2.2 Alternative 1: No Action LUP-Level Goals, Objectives, and Strategies

The No Action alternative would incorporate all goals and objectives associated with motor vehicle access and grazing management currently contained in the CDCA Plan, and which were not modified in the 2006 WEMO Plan. The Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the CDCA Plan goals below were not modified in the WEMO Plan in 2006. They include:

1. Provide for constrained motorized vehicle access in a manner that balances the needs of all desert users, private landowners, and other public agencies;
2. When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources;

3. Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the allowable motorized vehicle access routes. Ensure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow;
4. Use the existing parameters for route designation in the CDCA Plan, including the parameter that has been interpreted to limit route designations to those routes existing in 1980. The MVA Element of the CDCA Plan provides rules or parameters on implementation of access management decisions. This includes a parameter which defined the routes from which route designations could be made to “At the minimum, use will be restricted to existing routes of travel” at the time of the CDCA Plan approval in 1980. The Plan acknowledged in the MVA Element that identification or mapping was still needed to indicate of what the “existing route network” consisted.

The Geology, Energy, and Minerals (GEM) Element of the CDCA Plan goal below also was not modified in the WEMO Plan in 2006:

5. Continue to recognize ways of access and opportunities for exploration and development on public lands, including to critical mineral resources, potential energy resources, and minerals of local and State importance.

The CDCA Plan also makes indirect reference to several access-dependent objectives throughout the Recreation Element of the CDCA Plan. Vehicle access is recognized as one of the most important recreation issues in the Desert, including the identification of specific routes for recreational use. Key objectives of the Recreation Element that are dependent on the travel management network and that were not amended by the WEMO Plan in 2006 include:

6. Provide for a wide range of quality recreation opportunities and experiences emphasizing dispersed undeveloped use;
7. Manage recreation use to minimize user conflicts, provide a safe recreation environment, and protect desert resources;
8. Adjust management approach to accommodate changing visitor use patterns and preferences;
9. Make available the use and enjoyment of desert recreation opportunities by special populations.

The No Action alternative would incorporate all goals, objectives, and strategies associated with travel management and access currently contained in the 2006 WEMO Plan. The 2006 WEMO Plan did not provide additional objectives specific to travel management. Key changes to the CDCA Plan Access and Recreation Element’s Objectives made in the 2006 WEMO Plan included:

10. Adjust network-wide motor vehicle stopping, camping and parking parameters within DWMA’s, vehicle use of washes, use of specific lakebeds, and competitive use of routes and designated competitive-event corridors as outlined in the 2005 WEMO FEIS. The specifics of these plan-level parameters are outlined in Section 2.3.2 of this chapter, along with other elements of the No Action alternative.

The Livestock Grazing Element of the CDCA Plan goals were not modified in the WEMO Plan in 2006 and are listed in Section 2.2.1 of this document, Subsection on General LUP Goals and Objectives Common to all Alternatives. Key additions to the CDCA Plan Livestock Grazing

Objectives made in the 2006 WEMO Plan and included in the No Action Alternative and all other alternatives are also listed in the previous Subsection of 2.2.1. These changes resulted in the discontinuation of sheep grazing over large portions of the planning area, further limitations on ephemeral cattle and sheep grazing in the planning area, and the adoption of the voluntary relinquishment mechanism for specified allotments.

The specific allotments affected by the changes identified in the 2006 WEMO Plan are outlined in Section 2.3.2 of this Chapter and Table 2.4-3, along with other elements of the No Action alternative. Until approval of the Regional Standards by the Secretary of the Interior, grazing activities would be managed under the Fallback Standards and Guidelines outlined in the regulations. In addition to the general Grazing Management goals and objectives that are common to all alternatives, the No Action alternative would carry forward allotment-specific grazing management land-use planning decisions in the 2006 WEMO Plan, as modified by the 2012 Lava Mountain and Walker Pass Common Allotment changes authorized under the 2012 Appropriations Act, as discussed in section 2.2.1.

2.2.3 Alternative 2: Resource Conservation Enhancement LUP-Level Goals, Objectives, and Strategies

Alternative 2 would supplement and amend the CDCA Plan, as previously amended by the 2006 WEMO Plan, to adopt a comprehensive transportation and travel management strategy for the WEMO Planning Area and modify the livestock grazing program to provide for additional species conservation and desert tortoise recovery in DWMA. The transportation management goals and objectives of the Resource Conservation Enhancement alternative have an increased focus on the use of two strategies: 1) route closure and 2) limitation of access routes—in order to minimize damage to resources, minimizing harassment of wildlife, and minimize conflicts. The network's goal is to minimize by avoiding site-specific impacts to public land resources, and to utilize regional measures to minimize overall network impacts. The Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the CDCA Plan goals would be modified as follows:

1. Provide for constrained motorized vehicle access in a manner that recognizes the overall sensitivity of the West Mojave Planning area, while addressing the needs of all desert users, private landowners, and other public agencies.
2. When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources.
3. Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the allowable motorized vehicle access routes. Ensure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow.
4. Eliminate the parameter for route designation in the CDCA Plan that limits route designations to those routes existing in 1980, which is inconsistent with maintaining an access system that updates route designations as new decisions are made. The system would be updated consistent with the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 2 and associated travel management plans.
5. Continue to provide opportunities for exploration and development on public lands by identifying appropriate access through the route designation process, consistent with 43 CFR 8342.1 and other regulations, including to critical mineral resources, potential energy resources, and minerals of local and State importance.

6. Further limit the range of recreation opportunities and experiences outside of OHV Open Areas consistent with access goals, to enhance sensitive resource values and emphasize quality recreation opportunities and experiences focused on specific destinations, rather than enhanced dispersed use.
7. Manage recreation use to minimize user conflicts, provide a safe recreation environment, and protect desert resources.
8. Adjust management approach to accommodate changing access needs, visitor use patterns and preferences.
9. Make available the use and enjoyment of desert recreation opportunities by special populations, non-mechanized, and non-motorized users, as well as motorized and motor-dependent users, as resources permit.
10. Further limit stopping, parking, and camping outside of DWMA's to 50 feet, which would be equivalent to the 2006 WEMO Plan limitations within DWMA's.
11. In addition to the Parish's Phacelia lakebed closures, close one additional dry lake to vehicular use (Koehn Dry Lake) that was designated as "Open" in the 2006 WEMO Plan.
12. Eliminate the Johnson Valley to Parker Competitive Event Corridor in addition to the Barstow-to-Vegas Competitive-Event Corridor which was already eliminated in the 2006 WEMO Plan. Also, restrict the system of "C" routes available outside of OHV Open Areas through the SRP process to the current specified designated routes, consistent with the CDCA Plan, and further restrict the use of such routes seasonally to avoid sensitive resources, by travel management area.

Key changes to the CDCA Plan Access and Recreation Elements made in the 2006 WEMO Plan included adjustments to network-wide motor vehicle stopping, camping and parking parameters within DWMA's, to vehicle use of washes and on of specific lakebeds, and to competitive use of routes and designated competitive-event corridors. Alternative 2 would further constrain these objectives. The specific locations of these plan-level changes are outlined in Section 2.3.3 of this Chapter, along with other elements of Alternative 2.

This alternative would not amend the existing livestock grazing element goals, objectives, and strategies in the CDCA Plan and amendments and would not eliminate the existing, adopted strategies from the 2006 WEMO Plan for voluntary relinquishment and for managing grazing in allotments that would continue to be grazed. The first five goals of the No Action alternative, for overall management of the program, application of standards and guidelines, and voluntary relinquishment would be unchanged. This alternative would, instead of further limiting livestock grazing in DWMA's, eliminate all livestock grazing in DWMA's and CHU. The specific allotments and acreages affected are outlined in Section 2.3.3 and in Table 2.4-3.

2.2.4 Alternative 3: Public Lands Access LUP-Level Goals, Objectives, and Strategies

Alternative 3 would supplement the 2006 WEMO Plan to adopt a comprehensive transportation and travel management strategy for the WEMO Planning Area. The transportation network under the Public Lands Access alternative places an increased focus on strategies that maintain access to serve existing management activities, provide access on historic motorized routes, and include many of the recommendations of the Desert Advisory Council and other jurisdictions,

and minimize damage to resources, harassment of wildlife, and conflicts. Instead of more route closures, the network minimizes regional and site-specific issues and conflicts by avoiding, reducing threats, redirecting access, by utilizing regional measures to minimize overall network impacts, and by developing other site-specific strategies. This alternative puts an emphasis on monitoring of fewer route closures and management of a larger network. The Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the CDCA Plan goals would be modified as follows:

1. Provide for a wider range of motorized-vehicle access opportunities outside of OHV Open Areas, consistent with the management goals and regulations, emphasizing a broad range of additional uses and experiences in areas of low and moderate resource conflict and more directed access management in areas with higher resource conflict.
2. When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources.
3. Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the allowable motorized vehicle access routes. Ensure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow.
4. Eliminate the parameter for route designation in the CDCA Plan that limits route designations to those routes existing in 1980, which is inconsistent with maintaining an access system that updates route designations as new decisions are made. The system would be updated consistent with the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 3 and associated travel management plans.
5. Continue to provide opportunities for exploration and development on public lands by identifying appropriate access through the route designation process, consistent with 43 CFR 8342.1 and other regulations, including to critical mineral resources, potential energy resources, and minerals of local and State importance.
6. Further limit stopping, parking, and camping outside of DWMA to 100 feet from centerline, which would be a decrease of 200 feet from the 2006 WEMO Plan limitations. Within DWMA's, stopping and parking would be the same as the No Action Alternative. These parameters would not prevent designated areas which exceed these parameters, consistent with travel management plans.
7. Where needed, designated camping, parking, and staging areas, and trailheads would be identified on previously disturbed areas that connect with the designated route network, with appropriate signing and access restrictions. Sensitive areas and areas connecting to OHV areas would be stressed.
8. Provide for a wide range of quality recreation opportunities and experiences emphasizing dispersed undeveloped use. Focus access limitations to specifically avoid or minimize impact to sensitive resource values, and emphasize enhanced dispersed use.
9. Manage recreation use to minimize user conflicts, provide a safe recreation environment, and protect desert resources.
10. Adjust management approach to accommodate changing access needs, visitor use patterns and preferences.
11. Make available the use and enjoyment of desert recreation opportunities by special populations, non-mechanized, and non-motorized users, as well as motorized and motor-dependent users, as resources (i.e., funding, staffing) permit.

12. In addition to the Parish's Phacelia lakebed closures, close one additional dry lakebed (Koehn Dry Lake) that was designated as "Open" in the 2006 WEMO Plan to vehicular use. Open three other lakebeds (Cuddeback, Coyote and Chishold Trail Lakes) that are currently restricted to limit travel to designated routes across the lakebed.
13. Eliminate the Johnson Valley to Parker Competitive Corridor in addition to the Barstow-to-Vegas Competitive-Event Corridor which was already eliminated in the 2006 WEMO Plan. Allow for designation of competitive-use "C" routes outside of OHV Open Areas, including in specified MUC "Limited" areas, consistent with travel management area goals and route designation parameters.

Key changes to the CDCA Plan Access and Recreation Elements' Objectives made in the 2006 WEMO Plan included adjustments to network-wide motor vehicle stopping, camping and parking parameters, vehicle use of washes and of specific lakebeds, and competitive use of routes and designated competitive-event corridors. Alternative 3 would further constrain some of these objectives and loosen restrictions on others, on a site-specific or subarea-wide basis.

The alternative would not amend the existing goals and objectives for the livestock grazing element contained in the CDCA Plan and amendments, and would not eliminate the existing, adopted strategies from the 2006 WEMO Plan for voluntary relinquishment and for managing grazing in allotments that would continue to be grazed. This alternative would, however, include an additional goal of eliminating grazing on inactive, vacant allotments in desert tortoise habitat. The specific allotments and acreages affected are outlined in Section 2.3.4 and in Table 2.4-3.

2.2.5 Alternative 4: Community Access Enhancement LUP Goals and Objectives

Alternative 4 would supplement the 2006 WEMO Plan to adopt a comprehensive transportation and travel management strategy for the WEMO Planning Area. Alternative 4, the Community Access Enhancement Alternative, provides for motorized vehicle access in a manner that balances the needs of all desert users, private landowners, local communities, and other public agencies, by focusing on implementation strategies that promote and support active partnerships. The alternative utilizes the No Action Alternative as its basis, responds to public scoping comments, the recommendations of the Desert Advisory Council, and other agency and community input with respect to both resource conservation and increased recreational access. Then specific strategies are applied to minimize damage to resources, minimizing harassment of wildlife, and minimize conflicts consistent with increased emphasis on current use patterns, destinations, issues, and plans, where appropriate. The Motorized Vehicle Access (MVA) Element of the CDCA Plan goals would be modified as follows:

1. Provide for a wide range of dispersed recreation opportunities and diverse experiences in the West Mojave Planning area outside of designated OHV Open Areas considering local community and regional goals and objectives, relative resource sensitivities, current uses, and implementation strategies.
2. When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources;
3. Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the allowable motorized vehicle access routes. Ensure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow;

4. Eliminate the parameter for route designation in the CDCA Plan that limits route designations to those routes existing in 1980, which is inconsistent with maintaining an access system that updates route designations as new decisions are made. The system would be updated consistent with the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 4 and associated travel management plans.
5. Further limit stopping, parking, and camping outside of DWMA to 100 feet from centerline, which would be a decrease of 200 feet from the 2006 WEMO Plan limitations. Within DWMA's, stopping and parking would be the same as the No Action Alternative. These parameters do not prevent designated areas which exceed these parameters, consistent with travel management plans.
6. Where needed, designated camping, parking and staging areas, and trailheads would be identified on previously disturbed areas that connect with the designated route network, with appropriate signing and access restrictions. Staging areas, parking areas, trailheads, and other facilities that support these goals and objectives that would be utilized would stress partnership management and implementation strategies. Connectivity with OHV Areas would be a priority.
7. Continue to provide opportunities for exploration and development on public lands by identifying appropriate access through the route designation process, consistent with 43 CFR 8342.1 and other regulations, including to critical mineral resources, potential energy resources, and minerals of local and State importance.
8. Provide for a wide range of quality recreation opportunities and experiences emphasizing dispersed undeveloped use. Identify access limitations to specifically avoid or minimize impact to sensitive resource values, or to further limit the range of recreation opportunities and experiences outside of OHV Open Areas in lower use areas as appropriate to enhance sensitive resource values and regional watershed and habitat values.
9. Manage recreation use to minimize user conflicts, provide a safe recreation environment, and protect desert resources;
10. Adjust management approach to accommodate changing access needs, visitor use patterns and preferences;
11. Make available the use and enjoyment of desert recreation opportunities by special populations, non-mechanized, and non-motorized users, as well as motorized and motor-dependent users, as resources permit.
12. In addition to the Parish's Phacelia lakebed closures, close one additional dry lakebed (Koehn Dry Lake) to vehicular use. Open three other lakebeds (Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Dry Lakes) that are currently restricted to limit travel to designated routes across the lakebed.
13. Eliminate the Johnson Valley to Parker and the Barstow-to-Vegas Competitive-Event Corridor. Allow for designation of competitive-use "C" routes in MUC "Limited" areas, consistent with travel management area goals. Consider another competitive route corridor to replace the Johnson Valley to Parker Corridor, if one can be located that does meets the minimization parameters for sensitive resources.

Key changes to the CDCA Plan Access and Recreation Elements' Objectives made in the 2006 WEMO Plan included adjustments to network-wide motor vehicle stopping, camping and parking parameters, to vehicle use of washes and of specific lakebeds, and to competitive use of routes and designated competitive-event corridors, on a site-specific or subarea-wide basis. Alternative 4 would further constrain some of these objectives and loosen restrictions on others.

The alternative would not amend the existing goals and objectives for the livestock grazing element contained in the CDCA Plan and amendments, and would not eliminate the existing, adopted strategies from the 2006 WEMO Plan for voluntary relinquishment and for managing grazing in allotments that continue to be grazed. This alternative would, however, include an additional goal of eliminating grazing on inactive, vacant allotments in DWMAs. The specific allotments and acreages affected are outlined in Section 2.3.4 and in Table 2.4-3.

2.3 Description of Route Network and Network Implementation Alternatives

As discussed in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, each of the alternatives is composed of LUP-level decisions and implementation-level decisions. Land-Use planning level alternatives are outlined in Section 2.2 of this Chapter. Section 2.3 outlines implementation-level decisions, including the specific route designations under each alternative and other implementation components, and provides minimization strategies and mitigation measures for the alternatives. The Agency Preferred Alternative for travel management in the Draft SEIS is Alternative 3. The proposed action will be selected after circulation of the Draft SEIS and may include a combination of one or more alternatives. It will take into consideration comments on the Draft SEIS from local jurisdictions, other agencies, tribes, and the public, as well as further consultation with USFWS and the SHPO and ACHP. It will also reflect ongoing data collection and GIS updates.

2.3.1 The Use of the "Baseline" in the Development of Alternatives

In 2012, the BLM began two efforts that would provide a comprehensive baseline of routes for the West Mojave Planning Area. An intensive open-route signing project and subsequent monitoring project was conducted in the field using GPS handheld equipment that could directionally track routes as they were being driven and assure map accuracy. At the same time, high quality 1:2000 aerial photography from 2009 was being reviewed by GIS personnel and used to provide a digital record of all the open routes and any unauthorized routes that intersected the open routes. The result of these two concurrent inventories is a baseline of primitive routes (ground transportation linear features) in the planning area of approximately 15,000 miles.

This is approximately 7,000 miles more than the inventory for the 2006 WEMO Plan indicated, as identified in the 2006 WEMO Plan and discussed further in Chapter 3. As discussed in Section 1.1.4 and Appendix E, the increase in the inventory is due to several factors, including public land acquisitions, improved aerial photography technology, improved electronic data storage, and correction of previous mapping errors based on magnetic alignment. BLM's sample review of the recent and earlier route inventories indicates that these routes have been in existence for some time. Based on a sample review of 2005 and current (2013) data, the miles of primitive routes in the inventory is stable.

The previously undocumented routes that were found in the linear disturbance inventory, but were not identified in any previous inventory were considered closed to all motor vehicles in the

No Action Alternative regardless of when those routes may have been physically created, unless they have been determined to be limited to authorized users, under current permit or other authorizing instrument. Based on these assumptions the miles of actual route closures as a result of the 2006 WEMO Plan is substantially higher than the number that was actually reported in the 2006 WEMO Plan.

The No Action Alternative in this SEIS therefore does not represent the inventory of “linear disturbances” or possible routes existing on the ground. Decisions as to whether and how to implement route closures will be made on all linear disturbances based on 2009 aerial photography compiled as of January 31, 2013. Route inventory corrections identified between January 31, 2013 and the Draft SEIS will be incorporated into the Final SEIS.

Routes that are discovered or developed after adoption of this amendment will be evaluated for addition, exclusion, and limitation at the time of identification, development, or reclamation, based on the parameters of the adopted LUP amendment and travel management plan. Routes that are considered for inclusion in the route network in the future, must be consistent with the regulations of 43 CFR 8342.1, current BLM policies, goals of the CDCA Plan as amended by the 2006 WEMO Plan, applicable travel management plans and other pertinent area plans, and include compliance with other laws and regulations including but not limited to ESA and NHPA compliance.

Each of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft SEIS were developed by identifying the resource protection and transportation access objectives to be accomplished by the alternative, as discussed in Section 2.2. Then, for each alternative, the three components of the alternative were developed as follows:

- The travel management framework that would achieve the alternative-specific objectives for access management in the WEMO Planning area was established. This included delineation of TMAs to serve as the geographical basis for implementation of the route management plans;
- The language of the CDCA Plan Amendment that is required to bring the CDCA Plan into conformance with other policy and guidance, and to meet the objectives of the alternative, was developed; and
- The travel network, including appropriate minimization and mitigation for each individual route segment in the inventory to meet the objectives of the alternatives, was developed.

The selected alternative will be used to replace Section 2.2.6 of the 2006 WEMO Plan.

2.3.2 Alternative 1: No Action

Under this alternative, no further plan amendments would be made to the CDCA Plan, as amended by the 2006 WEMO Plan. The goals and objectives that exist under Alternative 1 are described in Subsections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Subsection 2.3 summarizes the process used to develop the alternative route network under all alternatives. The No Action Alternative is the travel management and grazing management strategy in effect. It is the strategy approved in the 2006 WEMO Plan, as modified by the US District Court (the Court) Remedy Order for specific routes, and reflecting recent changes that have resulted from legislation, or from identified valid existing rights. It does not address policy inconsistencies identified by the Court in its Summary

Judgment Order, including the limitation of the routes in the route network to existing routes as of 1980.

The No Action Alternative provides for access on public lands consistent with a broad species-conservation strategy and consideration of other resource values and uses. The route network would be applied within the context of the current CDCA Plan, as modified by the 2006 WEMO Plan².

Plan Amendment under Alternative 1

Under the No Action Alternative, no plan amendment changes would be made for the WEMO Planning area. The relevant existing plan decisions, which would continue under the No Action Alternative, are listed in Table 2.1-1 in Section 2.1.2, and again summarized below.

- PA I. There would be no change to the CDCA Land Use Plan language that has been interpreted to limit the 2006 WEMO Plan route network to existing routes of travel as of 1980. The route network approved under the 2006 WEMO Plan, as modified by the Court, would continue to be in place, and would be inconsistent with this LUP guidance.
- PA II. The CDCA Plan would not be updated to incorporate the framework for and be consistent with the TTM route designation process.
- PA III. Public land Access Area boundaries and Recreation Area designations in the CDCA Plan would be conformed to reflect changes as a result of the wilderness designations and the 29 Palms MCAGCC expansion legislation in the WEMO Planning area. These plan conformance actions reflect alignment of the land-use plan with legislative decisions and are non-discretionary.
- PA IV. CDCA Plan amendment triggers in the WEMO Planning area would be unchanged from the 2006 WEMO Plan as summarized later in this subsection.
- PA V. The Livestock Grazing Program Allotment designations in the CDCA Plan would be conformed with the 2012 Appropriations Act, which permanently relinquished the Lava Mountain and Walker Pass Common Allotments and reallocated their AUMs from livestock forage and use to wildlife use and ecosystem functions. These plan conformance actions reflect alignment of the land-use plan with legislative decisions and are non-discretionary.
- PA VI. A new Transportation Management Framework, including adoption of Travel Management Areas (TMAs) and associated objectives, would not occur. The access management framework from the CDCA Plan would continue to be utilized.
- PA VII. The Johnson Valley to Parker Valley Race Corridor would continue to be the one remaining race corridor available for permitting, subject to approval and receipt of a Special Recreation Permit, and competitive corridor parameters identified in the CDCA Plan, as supplemented through compliance with NEPA, Section 106, and

² It also reflects OHV area decisions resulting from post-2006 Congressional wilderness designations.

ESA. No permit has been granted for this race course since the listing of the desert tortoise.

Under this alternative the “C” routes that are to the northeast of the Spangler Hills Open Area above the Randsburg Wash Road would continue to be made available for competitive motorized races managed under a Special Recreation Permit. There are approximately 20 miles of designated trails that would be classified as “C” routes in this area. These “C” trails are located in gently rolling, more open terrain and are generally less technical in nature. In addition, approximately 15 miles of loop trails south of Spangler Hills have been designated under No Action. The adoption and use of other “C” routes would be subject to the plan amendment parameters identified in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and may include additional closure offset requirements.

- PA VIII. There would be no changes to access across dry lakes, as designated in the CDCA Plan and amended by the 2006 WEMO Plan. Koehn lakebed would remain designated as Open, as it was designated in the 2006 WEMO Plan. Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Lake Trail lakebeds would remain designated consistent with the surrounding area – i.e., “Closed to motor vehicle access, except for approved routes of travel or as authorized by Land Use Permit or Special Recreation Permit”.
- PA IX. The Rands Mountains Fremont Valley Management area would be managed consistent with parameters outlined in 2.2.1.2.4 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS, including the implementation of a visitor use permit program for those desiring to use vehicles in the Rand Mountains.
- PA X. The stopping and parking limits would remain as they are currently defined in the CDCA Plan. Stopping and parking can take place within 50 feet either side of the route centerline inside DWMA, while camping is restricted to existing disturbed areas along open routes. Stopping, parking, and camping can take place within 300 feet either side of centerline outside of DWMA. Camping is subject to an additional limitation of occurring in previously disturbed, adjacent to routes parameter, which does not change under alternatives.
- PA XI. Under the No Action alternative, livestock grazing would continue under the current terms and conditions contained in the Final Grazing Decisions issued for active grazing allotments within the West Mojave Planning Area. This would include the continuation of livestock grazing on the Ord Mountain Allotment within the Ord-Rodman DWMA, and the continuation of ephemeral sheep grazing on the Cantil Common Allotment and the Shadow Mountain Allotment within the Fremont-Kramer DWMA. Livestock grazing would be discontinued on inactive allotments in DWMA, to include portion of the Buckhorn Canyon Allotment. Under the No Action Alternative vacant allotments, including those in DWMA, would be subject to NEPA analysis upon receipt of an application to graze, and, if grazing is approved, would be subject to the terms and conditions of the 2006 West Mojave Plan.

Implementation Decisions for Route Designation/Minimization under Alternative 1

The No Action Alternative is the access strategy approved in the 2006 WEMO Plan, as modified by the US District Court (the Court) Remedy Order for specific routes, and serves as the alternative against which all other alternatives are compared. The access network included in the No Action Alternative is the adopted 2006 WEMO Plan network that is currently in use by the public, with minor modifications to correct route discrepancies identified during the inventory process. The focus of this alternative is to support the biological resource goals and objectives of the 2006 WEMO Plan, while also meeting other FLPMA multiple use objectives of the CDCA Plan. It provides for access on public lands consistent with a broad species conservation strategy and consideration of other natural and cultural values. The route network would be applied within the context of the current CDCA Plan, as modified by the 2006 WEMO Plan³, with the following modifications to address current management on-the-ground:

- Travel network designations are updated to capture current authorized and administrative routes that may not have been included in the 2006 WEMO Plan route designation effort, but which are based on valid existing rights (VER) to access, or meeting minimum agency requirements for emergency fire access. These changes are consistent with Section 2.2.6.11 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS.
- R5 and R50 are closed in compliance with the 2011 Court Remedy Order.
- Errors and network breaks are repaired to the extent feasible, if they do not change the overall network. These errors are specifically identified on the No Action maps.
- Routes not inventoried in 2006 are not included in the network, but would be addressed in implementation plans in the context of other strategies such as signing and law enforcement, as appropriate.
- Interim Signing and Kiosk Plans, Law Enforcement, and Route Monitoring Program approved by the Court are included in the No Action Alternative. Other signing, maintenance, law enforcement, monitoring, and rehabilitation activities would occur based on existing CDCA Plan, 2006 WEMO Plan Amendment, and ACEC plan priorities, consistent with available funding.
- 5,338 miles of motorized routes are designated and managed as available for some level of motorized use in subsequent implementation activities, based on the identified adjustments. Non-motorized routes were not specifically designated in the CDCA Plan or the WEMO Plan as a component of transportation and travel management network. A limited number of non-motorized trails have been evaluated outside of the context of transportation management, e.g. as a component of ACEC Management Plans. These non-motorized trails would continue to be available, in the context of existing activity plans and NEPA documentation.

The No Action Alternative for the transportation network is not equivalent to the current baseline inventory of linear transportation features. For land use planning actions, the No Action Alternative is the continuation of implementation of the management direction in the existing land use plan (BLM NEPA Manual, p.52). This is the continuation of the present level or systems of

³ It also reflects OHV area decisions resulting from post-2006 Congressional wilderness designations.

resource use (43 CFR 1610.4-5), that is, “no change” from current management direction until that direction is subsequently changed. (Council on Environmental Quality, NEPA 40 Questions, 3.A). The network associated with the No Action Alternative consists of the network designations that were made in the WEMO Plan (see WEMO FEIS Appendix R), with the modifications directed by the District Court and other modifications bulleted in the previous paragraph, and corrected where minor inaccuracies were found on the maps and where motorized routes are recognized by the BLM to provide access to valid existing rights.

In contrast, a baseline describes the present condition of the affected resources within an identified geographic scope (BLM NEPA Manual, p.53). Here the current baseline includes routes that exist on the ground as identified by the inventory efforts for this land use plan amendment project, whether or not they have been previously identified, evaluated or designated by the BLM.

The 2005 WEMO FEIS designated approximately 5,105 miles of routes as open (Open and Limited designations) to OHV use and 2,391 miles of routes closed to OHV use (p. 4-140, Table 4-45a). These numbers subsequently underwent minor adjustments such that 5,098 miles of route were designated Open or Limited (ES-5, 2005 WEMO FEIS), resulting in a similar modification of closures to 2,398 miles. The designated routes were identified on maps in a CD provided with the 2005 WEMO FEIS (App. C) and are also available online (see http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/wemo_plan_feis_maps.html).

These routes are taken from the final inventory of routes identified for the 2005 WEMO FEIS and previous inventories for the 1985-1987 route designation effort, the Ord Pilot route designations, and the ACEC Plan designations. The 2005 WEMO FEIS (p. 1-16) indicates that the inventory of routes consisted of almost 8,000 miles of routes, with some additional mileage from field survey crews in 1985 and 1987, during the preparation of ACEC plans, and digital data from 1995 and 1996, but does not provide a more specific total mileage for the entire planning area. However, the document does state that in areas surveyed, approximately nine percent or more of the routes were not found on the ground. The route designation mileage totals from the 2005 WEMO FEIS were slightly modified by the changes in the 2006 WEMO Plan ROD, and the subsequent closure of two specific routes by the Court, in its 2011 Remedy Order.

Consistent with Section 2.2.6.11 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS (FEIS p.2-167), the current network has also been updated to include valid existing rights (VER) routes that were not recognized in the 2006 WEMO Plan or which have since been approved. A records review of the lands and minerals database (LR 2000) has identified close to 300 miles of VER routes in the designated route network under the No Action Alternative. Most of these routes would have been permitted or otherwise authorized by the BLM before the 2005 WEMO FEIS, but this adjustment also includes ROW miles, such as those associated with major powerlines, that have been permitted since that time. This results in a refinement of the total mileage of routes in the No Action Alternative to 5,338 miles of Open and Limited Routes, and 2,158 miles of Closed Routes.

A recurring issue with the No Action Alternative route network involves the historic data used to develop the 2006 WEMO Plan and the underlying CDCA Plan. In the CDCA Plan the route network in limited use areas was based on “existing routes of travel” (CDCA Plan, 1999 amendment, p.76). Use in class “I” and “M” limited use areas was limited to “existing routes” (Id.) While many routes were clearly known and subsequently specifically designated as open,

closed or limited to OHV use in these use areas, others were not. This network of existing routes was later referred to in the 2005 WEMO FEIS (see Section 2.2.6.1). However, the network adopted in the 2006 WEMO Plan only consists of specifically designated routes throughout the entire planning area (see 2005 WEMO FEIS maps website). Many or most of these specifically designated routes within limited use areas were “existing routes of travel”. Other routes that were not designated in the 2006 WEMO Plan likely were and remain “existing routes of travel” but carry no formal open, closed or limited use designation. In any event, the FEIS maps, as with the modifications discussed earlier in this section, depict the 2006 WEMO Plan network brought forward in the No Action Alternative for the current planning effort.

The same lack of clarity is found in past route designation efforts, which in addition, have not been conducted in any consistent way over time. It is unclear, with the history of route designations in the WEMO Planning area, to what extent the “existing routes” concept is still valid. It remains unclear whether the universe of “existing routes” represents a floor or a ceiling of routes available for public and other uses, and finally, how routes in this category would be portrayed and distinguished from routes that are not “existing routes”. The No Action Alternative does not include the issue of “existing routes” in this planning effort. Rather, the No Action Alternative includes the specifically designated network, as modified (by the WEMO ROD, the court orders, the overlooked VERs, and minor adjustments) but does not resolve or clarify the “existing routes” concept as portrayed in the CDCA Plan.

BLM now knows that many other routes physically did exist on the ground within the WEMO planning area at the time of the 2005 WEMO FEIS, as evidenced by a review of 2005 aerial photography. As a result of the 2005 and 2009 aerial photography and field review, an additional 7,000 miles of routes have been located on the ground and included in the 2013 inventory that were not part of the approximately 8,000 miles of inventoried routes discussed in the 2005 WEMO FEIS. The inventoried miles for this project approximates 14,950 miles, as computed with GIS.

The 2013 updated inventory for this planning process identified many routes that were not considered during the 2006 WEMO Planning process but that exist on the ground. These additional miles of routes include those few hundred miles of routes available to authorized users but not identified at the time of the 2006 WEMO Plan, or which have been approved for authorized users since that time. However, for most of these routes, it is unclear why these existing routes were not documented, reviewed, and designated in previous planning efforts. Particularly in Motorized Access Zones, the focus of the route designation effort was on development of a cohesive network and conservation of biological and other sensitive resources. Some of these routes also are lightly and infrequently used, and either through natural or past reclamation activities, may have been considered to be on their way to rehabilitation even if they still show signs of disturbance (i.e., not existing). Likewise, it is not clear when the additional miles of undocumented routes were created (this lack of clarity was recognized by the Court in the Summary Judgment and Remedy Orders).

The additional miles of existing, undocumented routes include duplicate routes (e.g., routes that run right next to another) that were overlooked, routes in the “existing routes” areas that were not considered in the 1985-1987 or ACEC designation efforts, wash routes not readily recognized as OHV routes, motorcycle routes outside of the 2006 WEMO Plan redesign and reassessment areas, and other routes in the planning area that may not have been evident on the ground or that were overlooked. The weaknesses of the 1985-1987 inventories were already discussed in the

The additional miles of routes may include some that were created after the 1985-1987 route designation or after the 2006 WEMO Plan compilation and inventory efforts. A more complete discussion of the history of route designation leading up to the 2006 WEMO Plan may be found in Appendix E of this document.

A sample review of good quality 2005 and 2013 aerial photography indicates that the majority of these additional miles of routes appear to have been existing at the time of the release of the 2005 WEMO FEIS, and likely much earlier. However, the undocumented mileage of routes was not designated in the 2006 WEMO Plan, have not been subsequently designated through another planning process, was not evaluated and designated consistent with 43 CFR 8342.1, and exceed the parameters presented in the 2005 WEMO FEIS for modification of the route network, as explained in Section 2.2.6.11. Therefore, the additional mileage would not be included as part of the designated routes (open or closed) in the No Action Alternative. This is the case for any of the routes (or additional mileage thereto), whether they are identified as being in the “Redesign Areas” or the “Retention of Existing Routes” areas (2005 WEMO FEIS, Section 2.2.6.1, page 2-137). Under the No Action Alternative, in order to be considered for designation as an open route, undocumented existing routes (or additional mileage thereto) would need to be analyzed through an additional designation process. Implementation strategies and priorities for routes in this category would be pursued consistent with the strategies for designated routes discussed below.

The transportation network associated with the No Action Alternative is shown in Figure 2.3-1. The previous route designations made in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and as modified by the Court’s Remedy Order and updated to include additional VER and minor adjustments, would continue without change. A summary of the route designations under the No Action alternative is provided in Table 2.4-1.

Network-Wide Minimization under Alternative 1

The following strategies, summarized in Table 2.3-1, were utilized in the development of the No Action Alternative in the 2006 WEMO Plan to minimize impacts.

Table 2.3-1. Network-Wide Minimization Strategies Under No Action Alternative

Issue	Minimization and Mitigation Measure
Minimization of T&E impacts	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within DWMAs. Consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service and issuance of a biological opinion.
Minimization of Sensitive Species impacts	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within MGS Core Areas, and specific Sensitive plant species ACECs (Table 2-11, 2005 WEMO FEIS).
Designation of Newly developed routes ¹ (allowable ground disturbance limitations)	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance limits in areas identified above. Very limited opportunities to modify network without a plan-wide review, except for valid existing rights and new authorized activities.

Table 2.3-1. Network-Wide Minimization Strategies Under No Action Alternative

Issue	Minimization and Mitigation Measure
Designation of Previously Closed Routes	All routes closed under the 2006 WEMO Plan would remain closed, except for valid existing rights overlooked or subsequently approved, consistent with the No Action alternative.
Designation of Newly Identified Routes	All routes that were not identified for evaluated under the 2006 WEMO Plan and designated open or close would be treated as closed, pending future evaluation under the terms of the 2006 WEMO Plan. .
Stopping Minimization Strategies	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, limited to adjacent to designated open routes and within 50 feet either side of route centerline inside DWMA, and per CDCA Plan, limited to 300 feet either side of route centerline outside DWMA's.
Parking Minimization Strategies	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, limited to adjacent to designated open routes and within 50 feet either side of from route centerline inside DWMA, and Per CDCA Plan, limited to 300 feet either side of route centerline outside DWMA's.
Camping/ Second Vehicle Staging Minimization Strategies	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, limited to previously disturbed areas within 50 feet inside DWMA's; outside of DWMA's must occur within 300 feet of centerline of routes designated open.
Designation of Long-Distance Competitive Race Course Corridors and "C" routes.	The Barstow to Las Vegas and Johnson Valley to Stoddard Valley Race Courses would be eliminated and the Johnson Valley to Parker Course would be retained. Other Competitive events on "C" routes only. Not available on other Open routes.
Designation Parameters on Motorized Use of Washes	Allowed in washes designated as open routes only.

¹ Newly developed routes are routes that would require mechanical equipment or hand tools to be establish on the ground and are not present in 2005 aerial imagery or the 2013 inventory used to develop the WMRNP plan.

Post-Designation Implementation Strategies under Alternative 1

The process for on-the-ground implementation of route designations and grazing management under Alternative 1 would be based on the parameters of the WEMO Plan, as modified by the four implementation plans that BLM was required to prepare in response to the Court's 2011 Remedy Order. In the 2006 WEMO Plan, specific guidelines for implementation of route designation were outlined in the WEMO FEIS, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.6.10 to 2.2.8, and Appendix C, and summarized below. Specific guidelines for implementation of grazing management were outlined in the WEMO FEIS and Appendix C, and in subsequent grazing decisions for each active allotment.

In the 2011 Remedy Order, the Court directed BLM to submit certain additional implementation plans, but left the content of those plans to the discretion of the BLM. These plans, as they currently exist, are posted on the BLM WEMO Amendment website (http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave__wemo.html), and are currently being

implemented by the BLM. The four plans are a Sign Implementation Plan, a Route Monitoring Plan, a Route Maintenance and Kiosk Plan, and an Enforcement Plan.

The BLM considers the plans directed by the Remedy Order to be part of the No Action alternative. The Remedy Order provided that:

- The BLM should provide the Court with a detailed implementation plan for signing all open routes in the WEMO plan area.
- The BLM shall provide the Court with a monitoring plan to determine compliance with route closures, and whether new illegal routes are being created. The monitoring plan should demonstrate that the effort will be adequate to determine compliance at a statistically significant level.
- The BLM will provide the Court and the parties with a plan for maintenance of the open route network and installation of informational kiosks at all major OHV access points. The BLM will provide the Court and the parties with a plan for providing additional enforcement capability for the route network in the WEMO plan area.

The Court also directed BLM to undertake the following activities pursuant to the Remedy Order:

- The BLM shall update all BLM-produced and available maps to include accurate and updated route information, and, as necessary, include the following notice in particular type on all maps, pamphlets, kiosks, and other literature regarding WEMO OHV routes distributed by the BLM.
- The Notice reads: “Notice – Motorized use is permitted only on routes signed “open”. Any route that does not have an “open” sign is not legal for motorized use. Motorized use of any closed route will result in a fine or criminal prosecution”;
- The BLM shall carry out additional information gathering and monitoring regarding (a) air quality in and around open areas through air quality monitoring, (b) status of the Mojave fringe-toed lizard and its habitat, and (c) riparian areas and UPAs, including new “properly functioning condition” (“PFC”) assessments for all of the springs and seeps in the West Mojave planning area.
- The BLM will provide the Court and the parties quarterly reports indicating the BLM’s progress in implementing the above requirements.

The Monitoring Plan directed by the Court was submitted in April, 2013, and monitoring of the route network according to the plan began in July, 2013.

Implementation of the route network would continue to proceed according to the following priorities identified in the WEMO Plan, p. 2-165:

- Pursue funding for route signing;
- Pursue funding for route rehabilitation;
- Sign the open route network;
- Maintain the open route network, with an emphasis on making the open network of routes more obvious and attractive to use than the closed routes;

- Install informational kiosks and interpretive signing where it would be more effective;
- Develop and publish maps that are up-to-date, readily available, and have a readily understandable and useful format;
- Regularly maintain signs, kiosks, routes, maps, and brochures;
- When additional funding is received, pursue route rehabilitation in priority areas; and
- As additional funding is received, initiate two-year enforcement and visitor service patrols in specific areas. Enforcement priorities are identified in the WEMO FEIS, p. 2-71, as updated

BLM has implemented signing, completed installation of informational kiosks pursuant to the WEMO Plan, added additional kiosks in key locations, generated maps of the route network, is maintaining the network, and continues to seek additional funds for targeted law enforcement activities. BLM also continues to work on rehabilitation activities, and annually pursues additional funding, directly and with partners, to proceed with rehabilitation of routes in priority areas.

Specific implementation activities with a timeline are called out in Section 2.2.6.10 and Appendix C of the WEMO FEIS Implementation Plan and are elements of the No Action Alternative. Many of these are already implemented. If not yet implemented, their status is also included.

Table 2.3-2 Implementation Activities and Timeframes

Timing	Activity	Status *All activities assume funding is received.
Travel Management		
Year 1	Sign Open Route Network	Done
Year 1	Install Informational Kiosks and Interpretive Signing	Done
Year 1, Ongoing	Maintain Open Route Network	Ongoing
Year 1, Ongoing	Develop and publish maps and brochures	Done. Updates deferred to decision on this project.
Year 2	Identify and place fencing on the west side of Johnson Valley OHV Open Area to prevent unauthorized OHV use in the Ord-Rodman DWMA, and minimize use in the Cinnamon Hills area.	Done
Year 2, Ongoing	Monitor JV OHV boundary fence, repair vandalism, make outreach a high priority at the time of fence installation; and	Ongoing
Year 2, Ongoing	Identify and place additional fencing as needed along the boundary of Stoddard Valley and Johnson Valley OHV areas as needed to counteract effects on the Ord-Rodman DWMA.	Additional boundary fencing is anticipated in conjunction with the Johnson Valley expansion. No additional fencing identified on the east side of Stoddard Valley
Grazing Program		
Year 1	Modify boundaries (and kind and use) of cattle and sheep allotments, as approved in the WEMO Plan.	Done

Table 2.3-2 Implementation Activities and Timeframes

Timing	Activity	Status *All activities assume funding is received.
Year 1	Prohibit sheep grazing from those portions of the Stoddard Mountain Allotment that occur within the Mojave Monkeyflower Conservatoin Area. BLM shall work with the lessee to clearly identify monkeyflower habitat that shall be avoided.	Done
Year 1	Health assessments shall be completed for the Cronese Lake, Harper Lake, and Ord Mountain allotments. Results will be used as baseline information to develop needed corrective measures.	Done for Ord; Harper Lake and Cronese Lake allotments are currently vacant; therefore have become lower priority for health assessments.
Year 2	Health assessments shall be completed for the Cady Mountain, Hansen Common, Rattlesnake Canyon, Rudnick Common, Tunawee Common, and Walker Pass allotments.	Cady Mtn., Hansen Common, Rattlesnake Canyon, Rudnick Common, Tunawee Common assessments complete. Walker Pass premanently retired under the authority of the 2012 Approp. Act.
Year 2	Provide sheep lessees notification pursuant to 43 CFR 4110.4-2 (b) before actions in section 2.2.19.6 of the 2003 WEMO DEIS are implemented.	Done in grazing decisions.
Year 2	Implement the approved livestock grazing strategy.	Done in grazing decisions.
Year 2	Update the Ord Mountain Allotment Management Plan and install range fences in 2 locations to exclude cattle from high concentration tortoise areas found adjacent to the Ord Mountain allotment: the southern boundary of the allotment west of Cinnamon Hills, and the eastern boundary of the allotment in the vicinity of Box Canyon.	Completed interior fences that facilitate seasonal closures instead. Due to low stocking rates in the Ord Mtn. Allotment, the external range fences are now a lower priority.
Year 3	Health assessments shall be completed for cattle allotments outside of DWMA and the MGS Conservation Area, including Lacey-Cactus-McCloud, Olancha, Round Mountain and Whitewater Canyon.	Lacey-Cactus-McCloud, Olancha, Round Mountain and Kelso Peak assessments complete. Whitewater Canyon voluntarily relinquished.
Year 3	Determine if studies are needed to assess cattle or sheep impacts and determine any adaptive management prescriptions that may be required. These would include new management prescriptions in the Cronese Lake, Harper Lake, and Ord Mountain allotments to implement exclusion of cattle from specific areas when the threshold is below 230 lb/acre, and appropriate rest of certain pastures.	Done in grazing decisions, ongoing.
Year 3	Modify all existing cattle guards in desert tortoise habitat to prevent entrapment of desert tortoises.	Done.
Year 10	Determine grazing compatibility with sensitive biological resources, and subsequently undertake a NEPA analysis of management alternatives to issue a grazing decision that implements compatible management provisions.	

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Monitoring and rehabilitation priorities are identified in the Route Signing Plan posted at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave__wemo.html, and are based on a combination of factors including biological, wilderness, cultural, proximity to urban interface, and readiness. The basis of the biological priorities is outlined in more detail in the 2005 WEMO FEIS, page 2-164. Biological enforcement priorities outlined in more detail in the 2005 WEMO FEIS, page 2-71 and include higher use DWMA areas, DWMA adjacent to OHV Open Areas, and higher density tortoise areas.

In addition, funding is being sought to expand the current education and outreach community partnership, which began in 2005 and now reaches 16,000 school-age children in the Barstow area, and many more through activities funded by OHV Area Friends groups in the WEMO area.

Under the No Action Alternative, the route network is adopted as a component of the CDCA Plan. Major route network changes that exceed the parameters identified in 2.2.6.11 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS would require Plan Amendment and associated NEPA review. Minor route network changes are narrowly defined. Minor changes would include realignments to avoid identified cultural sites, reduce impact on special-status species or their habitat, or to substantially increase the quality of recreational experience, that would not affect sensitive species, their habitat, or other sensitive resources. Opening or closing routes where valid existing rights or easements were not accurately recorded, providing access to private inholdings are also considered minor changes, or serving the same access need as a currently open route which is being re-aligned. These changes would occur within the parameters set in the 2006 WEMO Plan. Minor changes are evaluated through an appropriate NEPA instrument (Determination of NEPA Adequacy, Categorical Exclusion, or Environmental Assessment, or Environmental Impact Statement).

2.3.3 Alternative 2: Resource Conservation Enhancement

The LUP-level decisions that would be made under all action alternatives, including Alternative 2, are described in subsection 2.1. The goals and objectives that would be established under Alternative 2 are described in subsection 2.2. Subsection 2.3 summarizes the process used to develop the alternative route network under all alternatives.

Plan Amendment under Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the five proposed plan amendment decisions (PA I – PA V) that are common to all action alternatives and are described in subsection 2.1.2, would be made.

Of the six proposed plan amendment decisions that would vary among alternatives (PA VI – PA XI), the following decisions would be made under Alternative 2:

- VI. Alternative 2 would delineate eight Travel Management Areas (TMAs) and associated modes of access and travel. The boundaries of the eight TMAs are shown in Figure 2.3-2, and are summarized in Table 2.3-3.

Table 2.3-3. Summary of Travel Management Areas under Alternatives 2 and 3

Travel Management Area	Sub-regions and General Location
1	Broadwell Lake, Afton Canyon, and East of Barstow signing sub-regions
2	Sierras, Darwin, and North and South Searles signing sub-regions
3	Juniper, Rattlesnake, Morongo, Wonder Valley, and Joshua Tree signing sub-regions
4	Jawbone, Middle Knob and Lancaster signing sub-regions
5	West Mojave North Barstow Desert Wildlife Management Area signing sub-region north of Interstate-15 and State Route 58
6	El Mirage (including Edwards Bowl area), Fremont, and Iron Mountain signing sub-regions south of State Route 58
7	Ridgecrest, El Paso, Rands and Red Mountain signing sub-regions
8	Lands adjacent to Stoddard and Johnson Off-highway Vehicle areas, and other signing sub-regions south of Interstate-40 and north of State Route 247 including east of Interstate-15

- VII. Alternative 2 would seasonally restrict the use of the currently designated “C” routes for competitive motorized races managed under a Special Recreation Permit outside of OHV Open Areas. Any race staging area for (C) routes would still be limited to MUC Intensive (Class I) lands, and pit areas would be limited to those areas previously dedicated as pit areas along a route, and analyzed as such in compliance with NEPA, Section 106, and ESA compliance.

Alternative 2 would delete the remaining designated long-distance race corridor, the Johnson Valley to Parker Valley Corridor in the WEMO Planning Area. This would not affect non-competitive special recreation events such as dual sports.

- VIII. Alternative 2 would add Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lake lakebeds to the list of designated Lakebeds, and would Close Koehn Lakebed (see Figure 2.3-3). The other three lakebeds would remain “Closed to motor vehicle access, except for approved routes of travel or as authorized by Land Use Permit or Special Recreation Permit”.

- IX. The Rands Mountains Fremont Valley Management area would be managed consistent with parameters outlined in 2.2.1.2.4 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS, including the continued implementation of a visitor use permit program for those desiring to use vehicles in the Rand Mountains.

- X. Alternative 2 would limit camping to previously disturbed areas adjacent to Open Routes within 50 feet from the route centerline, both inside and outside of DWMAs in the WEMO Planning Area. Stopping and parking would also be limited to within 50 feet either side of the route centerline in the WEMO Planning Area.

- XI. Livestock grazing would be discontinued in DWMAs and in CHU designated by the USFWS, with the exception of a small horse allotment, the Valley Well Allotment. Through this land-use planning change, lands would no longer be available for livestock grazing in portions of three active allotments, consistent with 43 CFR 4130.2 (a). The

affected active allotments in DWMA and CHU include portions of Ord Mountain, Cantil Common, and Shadow Mountain allotments. These allotments would have their boundaries adjusted to remove the DWMA and CHU lands from the allotments. The AUMs in the DWMA portions of the allotments would be reallocated from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions. See Table 2.4-3 in section 2.4 for acreages and a comparison between alternatives.

Livestock grazing would also be discontinued in inactive allotments in DWMA and designated CHU. Through this land-use planning change, lands would no longer be available for livestock grazing in two inactive, vacant allotments in their entirety, and a small portion of another consistent with 43 CFR 4130.2 (a). The inactive, vacant allotments include Cronese Lake and Harper Lake Allotments and a small portion of the Johnson Valley Allotment. The AUMs in the allotments would be reallocated from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions.

Implementation Decisions for Route Designation/Minimization under Alternative 2

Although all alternative networks are compared to the No Action route network (e.g., the 2006 WEMO route network as modified by the court and new legislation), all routes in the inventory were reviewed against the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria for possible inclusion in each action alternative, within the parameters of the alternative goals and objectives, including for Alternative 2; however the preliminary designations for routes reflect the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 2, and mediate against adding new routes to the network. The following parameters were used for identifying the preliminary Alternative 2:

- a. Stopping, parking and camping parameters would be further limited outside of DWMA, specific to Alternative 2 (see plan amendment IX), and used to further focus the impacts from criteria resources and the need for minimization strategies and mitigation measures.
- b. Routes designated as “Closed” in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision would be initially identified as “Transportation Linear Disturbances” under Alternative 2, subject to route-specific review.
- c. Routes which were undesignated in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision (i.e., features that were added in 2013 as a result of the GTLF inventory update and the on-the-ground signing process) would be initially identified as “Transportation Linear Disturbances”, subject to route-specific review. This parameter would help assure at least one alternative with less than 5,098 miles of routes, as required by the Court’s Remedy Order. In keeping with the resource protection focus of Alternative 2, this step in the process defaulted to closing all features which were not designated in 2006, and which were added to the inventory for the first time in 2013 even if they existed on the ground prior to the 2006 WEMO Plan. Final designations may have closed, limited, or opened these routes, based on additional information, as outlined in Section 2.1.4.
- d. Routes in OHV Limited Areas which were designated as “Open” in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and which have no resource or other designation criteria conflicts identified, would initially remain identified as “Motorized” (available for all travelers, including non-motorized or non-mechanized users), subject to route-specific review.

- e. Routes in OHV Limited Areas which were designated as “Open” in the 2006 Plan, but which may have resource or other designation criteria conflicts, were highlighted, in order to focus route-specific review the identified conflicts and to determine whether to minimize impacts through changing their route designations or to keep them available for public use and identify appropriate mitigation measures. Some of these routes would have been identified as closed under the initial GIS Alternative 2, depending upon the conflict types, intensity, and numbers (cumulative effects).
- f. Routes designated as “Limited” in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision would be identified as “Motorized-Authorized” or “Motorized-Administrative” (specific to the limitation), as applicable, subject to route-specific review. Many Motorized-Authorized routes would have undergone site-specific review and mitigation associated with a permit or other authorization. If conflicts were identified, these route features again were highlighted, in order to focus specific review for the identified conflicts. These conflicts would also be factored into determining whether routes would be available for public use and appropriate mitigation measures associated with route use.
- g. For routes located in a disturbance hotspot outside of DWMAs, the route would be designated as a transportation linear disturbance (closed), except as needed to maintain connectivity of the network, in order to minimize impacts to air quality and prevent additional habitat disturbance to the area. Disturbance hotspots are areas which have a significant density of routes within a very small area, such as historic vehicle play or staging areas.

The triggers used to initially identify the GIS version of Alternative 2 route designations involved the use of a series of resource-based criteria to determine potential need for minimization strategies and mitigation responses, and which would be most appropriate to accomplish the objectives of Alternative 2.

The triggers used to help determine whether a route or feature requires minimization and mitigation under Alternative 2 are provided in Table 2.3-4.

Table 2.3-4. GIS Minimization Triggers under Alternative 2

Criterion	Resource/Topic	Trigger Evaluation for Minimization and Mitigation
1	Soil Resources	10 percent or greater slope for 50 percent of route length, or significant erosion issues documented
	Riparian Areas	Route within 50 feet of riparian resources
	Springs	Route passes within 300 feet of a spring
	Desert washes	Route parallel to and predominantly within a wash
	Protected Vegetation Resources	Route within an ACEC designated for protection of vegetation resources
	Rare Plant Species	Route passes through a rare plant area
	Special Status Plant Species	Route passes through special status plant species habitat
	Air Quality	Route within 1 mile of sensitive receptor, or within 300 feet of a residence
	Cultural Resources	Route 50-300 feet from a cultural resource
	Cultural Resources	Route within 50 feet of a cultural resource
	Cultural Resources	Route within tribal area

Table 2.3-4. GIS Minimization Triggers under Alternative 2

Criterion	Resource/Topic	Trigger Evaluation for Minimization and Mitigation
	Grazing	Route within 30 feet of a range improvement
	Safety (preamble)	Route within 100 feet of abandoned mine or other identified safety issue
	Lands inventoried for wilderness characteristics	Route within a review area
2	Tortoise Habitat	Route within a DWMA designated for protection of desert tortoise
	Protected Wildlife Resources	Route within an area designated for protection of wildlife resources
	Golden Eagles	Route within ½ mile of golden eagle nest
	Mohave Ground Squirrel	Route within Mohave Ground Squirrel Core Area
	Wildlife Corridors	Route passes through an identified wildlife corridor
	Special Status Wildlife Species	Route passes through special status wildlife species habitat
3	Route Connections	Route ends at a jurisdictional boundary or at private property
	Designated Trail	Route intersects a designated trail
	Special Recreation Permits	Route used for or intersects Special Recreation Permit area
	Multiple User Conflicts	Route has multiple users which conflict with each other
	Disturbance Hotspots in DWMA	Route is located in a hot spot or highly disturbed area within a DWMA.
	Disturbance Hotspots outside of DWMA	Route is located in a hot spot or highly disturbed area outside of DWMA.
	ACEC	Route is currently designated in an ACEC/Activity Plan not identified above.
	Administrative Access	Route is authorized for administrative access
	Authorized Access	Route is authorized to specific user
	Noise	Route within 1 mile of sensitive receptor, or within 300 feet of a residence
4	Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) Class	Most of route is located in VRI II, and route was previously unknown or undesignated
	Wilderness	Route intersects with Wilderness boundary
	Wilderness Study Area	Route intersects with Wilderness Study Area boundary

Route-specific public scoping comments were available in GIS during the review process, and for routes which have multiple user conflicts, the designation would generally be deferred to the non-motorized or non-mechanized user over the motorized user under Alternative 2, to further minimize impacts to surrounding wildlife habitat.

In addition to resources for which minimization and mitigation triggers were developed, the GIS geodatabase in which route and resource information were evaluated contained data for numerous other specific resources. This additional data was available to BLM resource specialists for consideration when identifying minimization strategies or mitigation measures to

individual routes and features. In addition, the data allows the resource conflicts of the designated travel network within each alternative to be quantified. These quantitative resource conflicts are presented in the impact analysis of each alternative in Chapter 4 of this Draft SEIS.

The transportation network which resulted from this process for Alternative 2 is shown in Figure 2.3-4. The total mileage of the designated travel network and the transportation linear disturbances for each alternative, including Alternative 2, is summarized in Table 2.4-1.

The Alternative 2 network places an increased focus on the use of one specific strategy—closure—in order to minimize impacts to biological, cultural, and other non-biological sensitive natural resources and values, and minimize conflicts between uses. For previously existing, undocumented linear features that were identified in the 2013 inventory update, the default designation is for the feature to be designated as a transportation linear disturbance, unless a specific rationale identifies that a different designation would substantially enhance the network⁴. This approach is conservative, minimizing the number of previously undocumented routes designated “open” in the network, providing a second review of the current network based on the objectives for this alternative, and focusing on the use of route closure as the strategy for resolution potential route-specific and area-specific resource conflicts identified through the evaluation process. Alternative 2 network emphasis includes:

- Additional overall minimization of surface disturbance towards the longterm enhancement of watersheds, wildlife habitat, and other natural and cultural resources in the WEMO Planning area.
- Through-access oriented designation of routes.
- Area-wide route minimization across all public lands.
- Closure-focused route strategy.
- 4,293 miles of motorized routes.

Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternative 2

The following landscape or use strategies, summarized in Table 2.3-5, were utilized in the development of Alternative 2 to minimize impacts. Additional specific parameters for each travel management area may be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Table 2.3-5. Network-Wide Minimization under Alternative 2

Issue	Minimization Strategies
Minimization of T&E impacts	Consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service and issuance of a biological opinion. Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within DWMA's.
Minimization of Sensitive Species impacts	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within MGS Core Areas, and specific Sensitive plant species ACECs (Table 2-11, 2005 WEMO FEIS).

⁴ This is generally the case for Alternative 2 even when a minimization threshold does not trigger closure of the previously existing, undocumented route that was identified and evaluated.

Table 2.3-5. Network-Wide Minimization under Alternative 2

Issue	Minimization Strategies
Minimization of AQ impacts	Consultation with AQMD and SIP Conformity Evaluation. Additional new ground disturbance limits may be adopted as proposed in other programmatic strategies (e.g., DRECP) and the overall goals of the 2006 WEMO Plan and WMRNP goals, without further amendment.
Minimization of Cultural impacts	Programmatic Agreement with CA SHPO and ACHP.
New routes ¹ subject to allowable ground disturbance limitations	Subject to additional disturbance parameters in DWMA MGS Core Areas, and specific ACECs identified above, which may be further extended through other programmatic analyses. Also subject to plan amendment parameters in Section 2.6.
Route Closures	Routes that were closed under the 2006 WEMO Plan were re-evaluated for designation in Alternative 2, but only made available for use in a limited number of cases.
Newly Identified Routes	Routes that were not evaluated under the 2006 WEMO Plan evaluated for designation in Alternative 2, but only made available for use in a limited number of cases based on key network or resource needs or issues, and subject to minimization unless there were no conflicts with Alternative 2 designation criteria.
Stopping	Limited to within 50 feet from route centerline both inside and outside DWMA.
Parking	Limited to within 50 feet from route centerline both inside DWMA and outside DWMA.
Camping/ Second Vehicle Staging	Limited to previously disturbed, adjacent areas within 50 feet from route centerline both inside DWMA and outside DWMA, except in limited cases to minimize impacts to sensitive resources (designated camping/vehicle staging areas).
Permitted Events	Speed events limited to OHV Open Areas, and on designated "C" routes outside of DWMA and ACECs seasonally only. Non-speed motorized events in DWMA limited to routes designated in permit, with seasonal limitations. Non-motorized events are route specific, available on Open Routes unless otherwise specified in the permit.
Motorized Use of Washes	Motorized use limited to the those designated in the travel network.
Motorized Use of Lakebeds (those specifically designated in CDCA Plan)	Add Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail lakebeds to the list of designated Lakebeds. Close Koehn Lakebed, except by permit; keep as limited motorized use on Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lakebeds to designated through routes or authorized activities.
Motorized Use of Lakebeds (those not already specifically designated in CDCA Plan, the 2006 WEMO Plan Amendment, or this document.)	Limited to designated through routes, as further constrained in applicable ACEC Management Plans.

Post-Designation Implementation Strategies under Alternative 2

Specific components to implement the planning goals and objectives, including the route designations, of Alternative 2 include:

1. Other Resources and Uses

- a. Emphasize resource conservation and enhancement goals in the development of plan parameters, transportation management plans, and implementation of the network and develop additional strategies to enhance on-the-ground capabilities;
- b. Incorporate proposed and adopted DRECP route parameters, in order to enhance conservation goals and objectives;
- c. Give special attention to limiting non-essential multiple uses in special areas (WSA, ACEC, NRHP listed and eligible sites, Tribal Areas, Riparian Areas, etc.), and give special attention to the specific factors that have driven the identification and management of the areas, and associated access strategies; and
- d. Utilize route closure as a key measure to minimize resource and use conflicts on the remaining route network, unless otherwise identified in the goals and objectives.

2. Primary Travelers

- a. Manage access to de-emphasize casual multiple-use motorized and mechanized touring;
- b. Focus access to major recreational and non-recreational destinations that are not experiencing undue access-related impacts;
- c. Otherwise emphasize through-access on public lands to establish a comprehensive network;
- d. Consider a limited number of manageable loop trails that minimize loss of sensitive resources; and
- e. Emphasize joint-use over single-use trails (e.g, multiple types of vehicles) to limit habitat disturbance and concentrate use in less sensitive or more manageable areas.

3. Emerging Uses

- a. Emphasize limiting access to authorized uses only (rights-of-way, easements, range improvements, guzzler maintenance, mining, etc) where closure is not appropriate in sensitive areas; and
- b. Have the route network support current, and provide mechanisms to respond to new, landscape-level conservation goals and strategies and newly identified sensitive resources.

4. Landscape Settings

- a. Maintain, and, as appropriate enhance a diverse range of visual settings in the designation and management of the back-country network, with attention to special areas and consistent with other goals and objectives;
- b. Focus on maintaining recreational settings in the designation and management of the front-country network closer to urban centers, where appropriate.

5. Means of Travel Allowed to Accomplish Objectives

- a. Convert from year around motorized access opportunities to seasonal or non-motorized opportunities, that lead to sensitive points of interest, where appropriate; and

- b. Limit competitive motorized events to OHV Open Areas, or existing designated “C” routes, by special-recreation permit only. Further limit the permitted use of these designated “C” routes seasonally. No “C” routes would be designated through DWMAs or other ACECs. Other Open routes would not be available for motorized competitive events. Non-motorized events would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
6. Social Conflicts Between Different Travel Types
- a. Focus on joint use of through-access routes for visitors, permittees, local residents, and property owners, consistent with other agencies, state and local governments, where feasible;
 - b. Consider State and County-maintained Road plans when identifying access points to major roads;
 - c. Identify existing easements for joint use routes, as needed; and
 - d. Utilize minimization and mitigation measures (e.g., signing, fencing, closing routes, where appropriate) to address other known safety issues, conflicts between users, and impacts to sensitive resources.
7. Numbers and Types of Access Points
- a. Consider dedicated camping, staging and/or parking areas only in order to minimize overall size and/or impact of the area where stopping, parking, and camping (SPC) occurs adjacent to routes in sensitive areas. Camping, staging, and parking areas through sensitive locations may be further restricted based on changing conditions, as needed.
 - b. Eliminate or reduce motorized access through disturbance hotspot areas;
 - c. Develop partnerships or pursue area-specific strategies to address disturbance hotspots and reduce unauthorized use, as appropriate;
 - d. Limit access points to manage sensitive resource and social impacts; and
 - e. Develop strategies to identify and publicize where these access points are and how to get to them.
8. Baseline System and existing Geographical Identity and Public Knowledge
- a. Maintain an accurate route inventory for management purposes, maintain an accurate network for the production of both general and recreation specific Transportation Management Network maps, and make maps available to the public through a wide variety of means, including electronic means;
 - b. Pursue reciprocal easements and utilized existing public easements to facilitate management of the primary access network and routes to major destinations; and
 - c. Develop site-specific strategies at popular and sensitive destinations that are experiencing substantial impacts from access, where appropriate.
9. Non-Casual Uses
- a. Identify and direct ROW and other authorized activities to existing corridors/sites, when reasonable;

- b. Continue to add existing VER to the network with appropriate limitations and mitigation, consistent with the goals of this alternative. Site-specific issues would be resolved under the terms of the authorization, in consultation with the permit or right-of-way holder.
- c. Emphasize limited access and rehabilitation for commercial uses that are not major regional or interstate linear routes, when the authorization term expires; and
- d. Emphasize joint use of routes by multiple ROW holders when appropriate.

10. Boundaries for Management

- a. Adopt eight travel management areas (TMA) to implement the route network; and
- b. Manage access in each of the Travel Management Areas (TMA) to conserve sensitive resource values and areas, including sensitive biological, cultural, and other factors, consistent with the CDCA Plan as modified by the 2006 WEMO Plan and adopted ACEC Plans.

Future changes to the network would be developed consistent with these goals and objectives, and specific direction in travel management plans. General implementation direction includes:

Table 2.3-6. Draft Implementation Strategies

Implementation Priorities	Open routes to be signed as open and maintained, develop and publish maps, and other actions per the priorities identified in the travel management plans, based on key resource values and conflicts in each area.
Rehabilitation Priorities	Per the priorities identified in the travel management plans, to be established based on immediacy of risk and the number of resources affected. Focus on routes within DWMA and ACECs, affecting listed cultural sites, riparian areas, areas with sensitive receptors, areas with sensitive species, and areas with erosion issues.
Minor Route Network Changes	Minor changes to generally be identified and covered in travel management plans, considering designation thresholds and responses, necessary to avoid sensitive resources or impacts, private access and new rights-of-way needs, address small acquisitions, increase the quality of a recreation experience, and realignment needs. See Section 2.6
Major Route Network Changes	Requires associated subregion or TMA goals evaluation and NEPA review, and would include those which substantially alter transportation patterns in a subregion, are inconsistent with the alternative goals, large acquisitions with multiple access options, and addition of substantial routes to the current network that are not part of larger project review. See Section 2.6.

More specific parameters for each travel management area would be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Under Alternative 2, monitoring and rehabilitation priorities in the Route Signing Plan posted at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave__wemo.html, would be adjusted based on new information. The court ordered monitoring would continue, under the existing protocol, consistent with the details of the protocol, as amended. The priorities for implementation are based on a combination of factors including biological, wilderness, cultural, proximity to urban interface, and readiness, which would continue to be general guidance. Travel management plans would provide more specific guidance within the Subregions. The basis of the biological priorities is outlined in more detail in the 2005 WEMO FEIS, page 2-164. These would be augmented with additional priorities related to other sensitive resources, particularly in special areas or where critical needs have been identified by staff and management. In addition to higher use DWMA areas, DWMA adjacent to OHV Open Areas, and higher density tortoise areas, critical ACEC resources, adversely affected riparian areas and springs, and at-risk listed and eligible cultural properties would be high priorities.

In addition, BLM would continue to seek funding opportunities and other resources to expand the current education and outreach community partnership and other partnerships in the WEMO area.

Under Alternative 2, the parameters for route network changes for the WEMO Planning area would be updated to reflect actual operational needs and provide for adjustment of the network, consistent with parameters in the travel management plans and general thresholds for plan amendment changes outlined in Section 2.7. Opening or closing routes would be subject to appropriate NEPA compliance in all cases, including associated consultations, except in the case of emergencies, in which case NEPA would be completed consistent with regulatory requirements. These changes would occur consistent with the goals of the 2006 WEMO Plan.

2.3.4 Alternative 3: Public Lands Access Maintenance

The LUP-level decisions that would be made under all action alternatives, including Alternative 3, are described in subsection 2.1. The goals and objectives that would be established under Alternative 3 are described in subsection 2.2. Subsection 2.3 summarizes the process used to develop the alternative route network under all alternatives.

Plan Amendment under Alternative 3

Under Alternative 3, the five proposed plan amendment decisions (PA I – PA V) that are common to all action alternatives, and are described in subsection 2.1.2, would be made.

Of the six proposed plan amendment decisions (PA VI – PA XI) that would vary among alternatives, the following decisions would be made under Alternative 3:

- VI. Alternative 3 would delineate eight Travel Management Areas (TMAs) and associated modes of access and travel. The boundaries of the eight TMAs are shown in Figure 2.3-2, and are summarized in Table 2.3-3.
- VII. Under Alternative 3, there would be “C” routes available for competitive motorized races managed under a Special Recreation Permit year-round outside of ACECs, including outside of DWMA (see Table 2-2 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS) in three

distinct areas to enhance riding opportunities out of the smaller Spangler Hills OHV Area and partially offset the loss of similar riding opportunities in the Johnson Valley OHV Area, and to connect the Spangler Hills OHV Area to the community of Ridgecrest. These three areas are: to the northeast of the Spangler Hills OHV Open Area; the Summit Range plus the area east of Highway 395; and the urban interface area between the community of Ridgecrest and the Spangler Hills OHV Open Area.

The Johnson Valley to Parker Valley Race Corridor would be deleted and may be offset by additional “C” routes in the planning area outside of DWMAs and other ACECs that are identified as open “C” routes through the route designation process, consistent with TMA goals.

- VIII. Alternative 3 would add Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lake lakebeds to the list of designated Lakebeds. Koehn Lakebed would be designated as “Closed to Motor Vehicle Access, except by Authorization, including Special Recreation Permit”. Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lake Lakebeds would be designated “Open” to motorized use, subject to area specific minimization measures.
- IX. In Alternative 3, the permit system established for motor-vehicle access to the Rands Mountains-Fremont Valley Management area would be replaced with a limited designated network that is intensively managed. Initial management parameters would be identified in the travel management plan. Other general ACEC parameters would remain unchanged from the No Action alternative.
- X. Alternative 3 would continue to limit camping to previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 50 feet from the route centerline inside DWMAs. Stopping and parking would continue to be limited to within 50 feet of the centerline within DWMAs, except as site-specifically designated. Outside of DWMAs, camping would be further limited to previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 100 feet from the route centerline, while stopping and parking would be limited to within 100 feet of centerline, except as site-specifically designated.
- XI. Livestock grazing in active allotments would not change. Currently inactive, vacant allotments in DWMAs and other desert tortoise habitat would be unavailable for grazing in their entirety. These include the Buckhorn Canyon, Harper Lake, Cronese Lake, Cady Mountain, Johnson Valley, Double Mountain and Oak Creek Allotments. There would be a reallocation of forage attributable to 343,576 acres for livestock grazing to wildlife use and ecosystem functions within these allotments. See Table 2.4-3 in section 2.4 for a comparison of acres between alternatives that would be available for grazing.

Implementation Decisions for Route Designation/Minimization under Alternative 3

Routes and linear features in the 2013 route inventory were reviewed against the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria for possible inclusion in the Alternative 3 travel network. The designations for routes in this alternative reflect the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 3, and provide all routes equal consideration for inclusion in the route network, including those that were not included in the inventories used for the 2006 WEMO Plan, and therefore were not evaluated under the

designation criteria and considered while developing the 2005 WEMO FEIS route network. The following parameters were also used for identifying the preliminary Alternative 3:

- a. Stopping, parking and camping (SPC) parameters are further limited outside of DWMAs, specific to Alternative 3 (see plan amendment IX), and used to further focus the impacts from criteria resources and the need for additional minimization strategies and mitigation measures, except as identified for designated locations.
- b. For the preliminary Alternative 3, routes in the OHV Limited Areas designated as “Closed” in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision would be initially identified as “Transportation Linear Disturbances” under Alternative 3, subject to route-specific review.
- c. In the preliminary Alternative 3, routes in OHV Limited Areas designated as “Open” in the 2006 WEMO Plan, but which may have resource or other designation criteria conflicts, would not receive an initial identification. They would be highlighted to focus route-specific review for the identified conflicts and to determine whether to minimize impacts through changing their route designations or to keep them available for public use and identify appropriate mitigation measures.
- d. In keeping with the access focus of Alternative 3, this alternative defaults to maintaining current and historic public access, including on features which were not designated in 2006 (i.e., features that were added in 2013 as a result of the on-the-ground and GTLF inventory update). These features would be treated as currently designated routes in the network (no designation). Routes in OHV Limited Areas which were “Open” or which were NOT designated in the 2006 WEMO Plan, and which have no resource conflicts identified or do not otherwise trigger the need for minimization of impacts under the 43CFR 8342.1 designation criteria would be initially identified as “Motorized” (available for all travelers, including non-motorized or non-mechanized users), subject to route-specific review.
- e. Routes designated as “Limited” in the 2006 WEMO Plan are initially identified as “Motorized-Authorized” or “Motorized-Administrative” (specific to the limitation), as applicable, subject to route-specific review. Many Motorized-Authorized routes have undergone site-specific review and mitigation associated with a permit or other authorization. If conflicts are identified, these route features again would be highlighted, in order to focus the route-specific review for the identified conflicts. These conflicts would also be factored into determining whether routes would be available for public use and appropriate mitigation measures associated with route use.
- f. Under Alternative 3, a the designation of route ending at a jurisdictional boundary or private property would generally be initially designated in a similar manner as those in Alternative 2 unless a range of options presented itself, consistent with the designation criteria.
- g. For routes used for, or intersecting, a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) area, the route would generally be initially modified to match the form of SRP use (e.g., non-motorized for mountain bike use). In the case where multiple types of SRP use exist, the route designation in this alternative would initially be the most inclusive designation, consistent with the minimization criteria. If the route intersected an SRP area, the route would be

initially designated as motorized to provide access to the area. Additional mitigation measures would be included as necessary to address criteria resources, and adjustments would be made based on site specific review.

- h. For routes which have multiple user conflicts, the initial designation deferred the designation to the motorized user over the non-motorized or non-mechanized user under Alternative 3, consistent with the designation criteria. If the conflict was between forms of motorized users, the designation deferred to smallest vehicle (i.e., motorcycle above four-wheel drive vehicle). Generally the other options would be captured in Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 to give a full range of alternatives, if appropriate. Additional mitigation measures would be identified as needed.
- i. Under Alternative 3, routes intersecting a national designated trail would also be designated in a similar manner as Alternative 2, unless a range of options presented itself. If the route provides access to a trailhead, it would be designated as motorized, unless there were no parking or staging area, or if the route is located a distance from the designated trail, consistent with the designation criteria. If the route conflicted with trail use, such as traveling parallel to the trail, then it would generally be designated as a transportation linear disturbance (closed). Additional measures would be identified as needed. This alternative may be further adjusted to conform it with strategies for motorized access setbacks from designated trails as currently proposed in the Draft DRECP and available at <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/prog/energy/DRECP/policy.html>.
- j. For routes located in a disturbance hotspot within sensitive areas, the route would be initially identified as a transportation linear disturbance (closed), except as needed to maintain connectivity of the network or to access key resource and recreational sites, in order to minimize impacts to air quality and prevent additional habitat disturbance to the area. For routes located in a disturbance hotspot outside of sensitive areas that would otherwise be “Open”, the route designation was initially identified as “Open” and site-specifically reviewed. Where appropriate, at least one motorized route was maintained in the various directions, unless a designation of transportation linear disturbance (closed) was needed to improve manageability of the area. If additional conflicts existed, depending on the severity, an entire area of routes may have been closed or open with mitigation measures. A few hotspots may be identified as potential staging or camping areas under Alternative 3. Disturbance hotspots are areas which have a significant density of routes within a very small area, such as historic vehicle play or staging areas.

The triggers used to initially identify the GIS version of Alternative 3 route designations are identified below. The triggers are also used to determine whether a route or feature requires minimization and mitigation under Alternative 3 and Alternative 4 are provided in Table 2.3-7.

Table 2.3-7. Criteria Triggering Minimization & Mitigation under Alternative 3 and Alternative 4

Criterion	Resource/Topic	Minimization and Mitigation Trigger
1	Soil Resources	10 percent or greater slope for 75 percent of route length, or significant erosion issues documented
	Riparian Areas	Route within 50 feet of riparian resources
	Springs	Route passes within 300 feet of a spring
	Desert washes	Route parallel to and predominantly within a wash

Table 2.3-7. Criteria Triggering Minimization & Mitigation under Alternative 3 and Alternative 4

Criterion	Resource/Topic	Minimization and Mitigation Trigger
	Protected Vegetation Resources	Route within an area designated for protection of vegetation resources
	Rare Plant Species	Route passes through a rare plant area
	Special Status Plant Species	Route passes through special status plant species habitat
	Air Quality	Route within ¼ mile of sensitive receptor, or within 300 feet of a residence
	Cultural Resources	Route within 50-100 feet of a cultural resource
	Cultural Resources	Route within 50 feet of a cultural resource
	Cultural Resources	Route within tribal area
	Grazing	Route within 30 feet of a range improvement
	Safety	Route within 100 feet of abandoned mine or other identified safety issue
	Lands inventoried for wilderness characteristics	Route within a review area
2	Tortoise Habitat	Route within a DWMA designated for protection of desert tortoise
	Protected Wildlife Resources	Route within an area designated for protection of wildlife resources
	Golden Eagles	Route within ½ mile of golden eagle nest
	Mohave Ground Squirrel	Route within Mohave Ground Squirrel Core Area
	Wildlife Corridors	Route passes through an identified wildlife corridor
	Special Status Wildlife Species	Route passes through special status wildlife species habitat
3	Route Connections	Route ends at a jurisdictional boundary or at private property
	Designated Trail	Route intersects a designated trail
	Special Recreation Permits	Route used for or intersects Special Recreation Permit area
	Multiple User Conflicts	Route has multiple users which conflict with each other
	Disturbance hotspots in DWMA	Route is located in a hot spot or highly disturbed area within a DWMA.
	Disturbance hotspots outside of DWMA	Route is located in a hot spot or highly disturbed area outside of DWMA.
	Route Designation	Route is currently designated in an ACEC/Activity Plan
	Administrative Access	Route is authorized for administrative access
	Authorized Access	Route is authorized to specific user
	Noise	Route within ¼ mile of sensitive receptor, or within 300 feet of a residence
4	Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) Class	Most of route is located in VRI II, and route was previously unknown or undesignated
	Wilderness	Route intersects with Wilderness boundary
	Wilderness Study Area	Route intersects with Wilderness Study Area boundary
	ACEC	Route is within or intersects with ACEC boundary

The transportation network associated with Alternative 3 is shown in Figure 2.3-5. The total mileage of the designated travel network and the transportation linear disturbances for each alternative, including Alternative 3, is summarized in Table 2.4-1.

The transportation network under this alternative focuses on maintenance of access to serve multiple-use management, where such access is consistent with regulatory criteria and policies for natural and cultural resource and multi-species conservation. For previously existing, undocumented linear features identified in the 2013 inventory update, the default is for the designation of the feature and minimization and mitigation measures to be considered within the context of potential resource conflicts. This approach focuses on the use of other minimization strategies and mitigation measures, as opposed to route closure, as the primary strategy for resolution of identified resource conflicts, where feasible.

- Destination- and Touring-access oriented designation of routes.
- Area-wide minimization across all public lands.
- Recreation/Conservation Balanced minimization and mitigation strategy.
- Broad network-opportunities
- Site-specific problem-focused implementation.
- 10,428 miles of motorized routes.

Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternative 3

The following landscape or use strategies, summarized in Table 2.3-8, were utilized in the development of Alternative 3 to minimize impacts. Additional specific parameters for each travel management area may be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Table 2.3-8. Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternatives 3 and 4

Issue	Minimization and Mitigation Measure
Minimization of T&E impacts	Consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service and issuance of a biological opinion. Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within DWMAs, No limit on ground disturbances outside DWMAs or other biological sensitivity areas, but may be extended as proposed in other programmatic strategies as identified below.
Minimization of Sensitive Species impacts	Per 2006 WEMO Plan, 1% allowable new ground disturbance within MGS Core Areas, and specific Sensitive plant species ACECs (Table 2-11, 2005 WEMO FEIS). No limit on ground disturbances outside DWMAs or other biological sensitivity areas, but may be extended as proposed in other programmatic strategies as identified below.
Minimization of AQ impacts	Consultation with AQMD and SIP Conformity Evaluation. 1% allowable new ground disturbance parameters. Additional new ground disturbance limits

Table 2.3-8. Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternatives 3 and 4

Issue	Minimization and Mitigation Measure
	may be adopted as proposed in other programmatic strategies (e.g., DRECP) and the overall goals of the 2006 WEMO Plan and WMRNP goals, without further amendment.
Minimization of Cultural impacts	Programmatic Agreement with CA SHPO and ACHP.
New routes subject to allowable ground disturbance limitations in DWMA, MGS Core Areas, and specific ACECs	Subject to 1% allowable new ground disturbance parameters, which may be further tightened through other programmatic analyses. Also subject to plan amendment parameters in Section 2.6.
New routes subject to allowable ground disturbance limitations outside of DWMA, MGS Core Areas, and specific ACECs with disturbance limitations	Additional limitations may be developed for other sensitive resources, without further amendment, as part of the adaptive management strategy and consistent with 2006 WEMO Plan and TMA goals.
Route Closures	Routes that were evaluated and designated as “Closed” under the 2006 WEMO Plan were initially identified as closed in Alternatives 3 and 4, subject to route-specific review.
Newly Identified Routes	All routes were evaluated using the same designation criteria in Alternatives 3 and 4. In Alternative 3, no initial designation was assigned to newly identified routes; preliminary designations resulted from the initial GIS analysis, and those with conflicts were highlighted. The site specific review focused on these issues and other site-specific input. In Alternative 4, routes not included in the 2006 network were initially identified as closed, except for initial changes based on identified issues and needs. This network was then subject to route-specific review, focusing on identified conflicts.
Stopping	Except as site-specifically designated, limited to previously disturbed areas within 50 feet from the route centerline inside DWMA, and previously disturbed areas within 100 feet from the route centerline outside DWMA.
Parking	Except as site-specifically designated, limited to previously disturbed areas within 50 feet from the route centerline inside DWMA, and previously disturbed areas within 100 feet from the route centerline outside DWMA.
Camping/ Second Vehicle Staging	Except as site-specifically designated, limited to previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 50 feet from the route centerline inside DWMA, and previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 100 feet from the route centerline outside DWMA Parameters for specifically designated camping and staging areas are identified on a site-specific basis both for conservation purposes and for recreational enhancement.

Table 2.3-8. Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternatives 3 and 4

Issue	Minimization and Mitigation Measure
Permitted Events (Alternatives 3 and 4 vary)	Speed events are limited to designated “C” routes outside of OHV Open Areas. Non-speed motorized events in DWMA and ACECs are limited to routes designated in the Permit. Alternative 3 also includes seasonal or monitoring limitations, which are location specific. Alternative 4 limits the designated “C” routes to specifically identified areas. Non-motorized permitted events are available on Open Routes unless otherwise specified. All events are subject to NEPA compliance and permit requirements, and may require consultation with other agencies.
Motorized Use of Washes	Motorized use limited to the motorized routes designated travel network.
Motorized Use of Lakebeds (those specifically designated in CDCA Plan)	Add Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail lakebeds to the list of designated Lakebeds. “Close” Koehn Lakebed except as authorized in a land-use or special-recreation permit. Designate as “Open” Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lakebeds to motorized use, subject to appropriate minimization measures.
Motorized Use of other Lakebeds (those not already specifically designated in CDCA Plan, the 2006 WEMO Plan Amendment, or this document.)	Limited to designated through routes, except as further constrained in ACEC Management Plans.

Post-Designation Implementation Strategies under Alternative 3

Specific components of Alternative 3 to implement the planning goals and objectives include:

1. Other Resources and Uses
 - a. Support resource conservation and enhancement goals while providing opportunities to experience the desert’s unique resource values in the plan parameters and the development and management of the network;
 - b. Give special attention to the goals in special areas (WSA, ACEC, NRHP sites, Tribal Areas, Riparian Areas, Special Recreation Management Areas, etc.), and the specific factors that have driven the identification and management of the areas, and associated access strategies;
 - c. Conform to proposed and adopted DRECP route parameters, in order to enhance conservation goals and objectives and provide consistent proposed management strategies;
 - d. De-emphasize route closure as a primary means to minimize resource and use conflicts on the remaining routes selected for the network, where consistent with area goals; and
 - e. Emphasize regional, network and tiered measures to minimize conflicts, including those which are consistent with or enhance similar strategies of other jurisdictions.

2. Primary Travelers

- a. Manage access to emphasize casual multiple-use motorized and mechanized touring.
- b. Provide access to recreational and non-recreational destinations that are not experiencing undue access-related impacts.
- c. Expand the current “C” network to enhance riding opportunities in and around the City of Ridgecrest, and connect to the Spangler Hills Open Area in and around the City of Ridgecrest, to add topographic diversity, provide technically challenging opportunities to riders of all skill levels, facilitate long distance OHV competitive events, link the community of Ridgecrest and the Spangler Hills OHV Open Area, and partially offset Johnson Valley OHV Area competitive event opportunities lost with the expansion of the Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps Air Combat Center (29 Palms Base). This would include approximately 20-30 miles of routes in each of the Summit Range area and the area east of Highway 395 along with the area to the northeast of the OHV Open Area as identified in the Spangler Hills OHV Area Management Plan (1992).
- d. Identify a link between the Outlet Center Mall in Barstow to the Stoddard Valley OHV Open Area via a connector route.
- e. Identify a specific route for the speed-controlled connector between the remaining Johnson Valley OHV Area and the Stoddard Valley OHV Area, with appropriate minimization and mitigation measures. This connector was adopted in the 2006 WEMO Plan, but no specific route was ultimately delineated.
- f. Identify a connector loop between the two remaining pieces of the Johnson Valley OHV Area, with appropriate minimization and mitigation measures. As needed coordinate with the 29 Palms Base to facilitate completion of the loop. This may require some minor rerouting, with appropriate NEPA/ESA/Section 106 compliance, along the current Right-of-Way boundary with the Base.
- g. Consider some linear and loop trail opportunities in sensitive areas that do not have substantial evidence of unauthorized use and include strategies that minimize unauthorized use and potential impacts to sensitive resources.
- h. Balance joint-use and single-use trails (e.g, multiple types of vehicles or ways of travel) to enhance opportunities for unique recreational experiences; and
- i. In less sensitive areas, provide for a reasonable amount of recreational and touring opportunities, in addition to providing through-access on public lands to establish a comprehensive network.

3. Emerging Uses

- a. Consider emerging access and access-dependent needs in development and management of the network; and
- b. Have the route network support landscape-level conservation and use goals and strategies.

4. Landscape Settings

- a. Maintain a diverse range of visual experiences in the development and management of the network, where appropriate, with special attention to special areas and destinations, consistent with other goals and objectives; and
- b. Maintain or enhance recreational settings in the development and management of the network, where appropriate.

5. Means of Travel Allowed to Accomplish Objectives

- a. Provide an array of diverse and unique uses at recreation destinations, where appropriate; and
- b. Competitive motorized events would be allowed to occur outside of OHV Open Areas under Special Recreation Permit on routes specified for such use as identified in the TMP route network strategies.

6. Social Conflicts Between Different Travel Types

- a. Provide for joint use of through access for visitors, local residents, and property owners if unique user opportunities are not the focus of the area or routes, consistent with other agencies, state and local governments, where appropriate;
- b. Provide additional access opportunities to underserved motorized or non-motorized recreation types insofar as it is consistent with other objectives;
- c. Identify existing easements for joint use routes, as possible; and
- d. Utilize minimization and mitigation measures (e.g., signing, fencing, education, closing routes, where appropriate) to address known safety issues, conflicts between users, and impacts to resources.

7. Numbers and Types of Access Points

- a. Emphasize SPC adjacent to routes, consistent with network parameters, unless in heavily impacted or popular areas. In heavily impacted, sensitive areas and popular areas consider dedicated SPC or other strategies. These may extend beyond standard SPC to limit impacts to sensitive resources, to maintain widely dispersed off-route use, or to connect popular areas to communities.
- b. Identify designated SPC areas and trailheads on previously disturbed areas that connect with the designated route network. Designated areas would include appropriate signing and access restrictions in order to limit proliferation, subject to site-specific analysis.
- c. Any race staging area for (C) routes would continue to be limited to MUC Intensive (Class I) lands, and pit areas would be limited to those areas analyzed as such in compliance with NEPA, Section 106, and ESA compliance.
- d. Identify SPC designated areas near the Cerro Coso Community College and the Desert Empire Fairgrounds in the City of Ridgecrest in support of the Spangler Hills OHV Area connector, and near the Outlet Mall in the City of Barstow in support of the Barstow to Stoddard Valley OHV Area connector, as needed.

- e. Consider SPC designated areas along Hoffman Road in the Fremont-Kramer DWMA, within the Superior-Cronese DWMA in the Coolgardie area, within the Superior-Cronese DWMA in the Black Mountain area, and within the Juniper Flats Subregion near the USFS boundary, and at other identified locations, subject to site-specific analysis and consistent with the goals of this alternative and route designation criteria.
 - f. Reduce motorized access through sensitive areas with disturbance hotspots;
 - g. Develop partnerships or pursue area-specific strategies to address disturbance hotspots and reduce unauthorized use, as appropriate;
 - h. Limit access points in high conflict areas to manage sensitive resource and social impacts; and
 - i. Develop strategies to identify and publicize where access points are and how to get to them.
8. Baseline System and existing Geographical Identity and Public Knowledge
- a. Maintain an accurate route inventory for management purposes, and for the production of both general and recreation specific Transportation Management Network maps, and make those maps available to the public through electronic means;
 - b. Pursue reciprocal easements and utilize existing public easements to facilitate management of the primary access network; and
 - c. Develop site-specific strategies at popular and sensitive destinations that are experiencing substantial impacts from access, where appropriate.
9. Non-Casual Uses
- a. Identify and direct ROW and other authorized activities to existing corridors/sites, when reasonable;
 - b. Continue to add existing VER to the network with appropriate limitations and mitigation, consistent with the goals of this alternative. Site-specific issues would be resolved under the terms of the authorization, in consultation with the permit or right-of-way holder.
 - c. Consider adding routes to the network that have previously been used for authorized uses if they enhance the network, consistent with other Plan goals, when the authorization terms expire; and
 - d. Emphasize joint use of routes by multiple ROW holders, when appropriate.
10. Boundaries for Management
- a. Adopt eight TMAs to implement the route network;
 - b. Manage access in each of these TMAs to provide public lands access while minimizing impairment to sensitive resource values and areas, including sensitive biological factors, cultural, and other factors, consistent with all of the CDCA Plan, as modified by the 2006 WEMO Plan;

- c. Manage access in each of the TMAs to enhance special areas and identified recreation management goals and facilities within or adjacent to them, consistent with other area goals.

Future changes to the network would be developed consistent with these goals and objectives. General implementation direction is identified in Table 2.3-6. More specific parameters for each travel management area would be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Under Alternative 3, monitoring and rehabilitation priorities in the Route Signing Plan posted at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave__wemo.html, would be adjusted based on new information. The court ordered monitoring would continue, under the existing protocol, consistent with the details of the protocol. The priorities for implementation are based on a combination of factors including biological, wilderness, cultural, proximity to urban interface, and readiness, which would continue to be general guidance. Travel management plans would provide more specific guidance within the Subregions, and may also factor in specific recreational and other access implementation priorities, depending on the area. The basis of the biological priorities is outlined in more detail in the 2005 WEMO FEIS, page 2-164. These would be augmented with additional priorities related to other sensitive resources, particularly in special areas or where critical needs have been identified by staff and management. In addition to higher use DWMA areas, DWMA adjacent to OHV Open Areas, and higher density tortoise areas, critical ACEC resources, adversely affected riparian areas and springs, and at-risk listed and eligible cultural properties would be high priorities.

In addition, BLM would continue to seek funding opportunities and other resources to expand the current education and outreach community partnership and other partnerships in the WEMO area.

Under Alternative 3, the parameters for route network changes for the WEMO Planning area would be updated to reflect actual operational needs and provide for adjustment of the network, consistent with parameters in the travel management plans and general thresholds for plan amendment changes outlined in Section 2.7. Opening or closing routes would be subject to appropriate NEPA compliance in all cases, including appropriate consultations, except in the case of emergencies, in which case NEPA would be completed consistent with regulatory requirements. These changes would occur within the parameters set in the 2006 WEMO Plan.

2.3.5 Alternative 4: Community Access Enhancement

The LUP-level decisions that would be made under all action alternatives, including Alternative 4, are described in subsection 2.1. The goals and objectives that would be established under Alternative 4 are described in subsection 2.2. Subsection 2.3 summarizes the process used to develop the alternative route network under all alternatives.

Plan Amendment under Alternative 4

Under Alternative 4, the five proposed plan amendment decisions (PA I – PA V) that are common to all action alternatives, and are described in subsection 2.1.2, would be made.

Of the six proposed plan amendment decisions (PA VI – PA XI) that vary among alternatives, the following decisions would be made under Alternative 4:

- VI. Alternative 4 would delineate nine Travel Management Areas (TMAs) and associated modes of access and travel. The boundaries of the nine TMAs are shown in Figure 2.3-6. The boundaries of the nine TMAs included in Alternative 4 are similar to those in Alternatives 2 and 3, with the exception that TMA 7 (Ridgecrest, El Paso, Rands, and Red Mountain sub-regions) would be split into two separate TMAs. The Rands and Red Mountain sub-regions would remain designated as TMA 7, but the Ridgecrest and El Paso sub-regions would be managed separately as TMA 9.
- VII. Under Alternative 4, there would be “C” routes available for competitive motorized races managed under a Special Recreation Permit year-round outside of ACECs, including outside of DWMAS (see Table 2-2 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS) in distinct areas to enhance riding opportunities out of the smaller Spangler Hills OHV Area and partially offset the loss of similar riding opportunities in the Johnson Valley OHV Area. These “C” routes are to the northeast of the Open Area above the Randsburg Wash Road and within the Summit Range and east of Highway 395 and would be managed under a Special Recreation Permit. There are approximately 20 to 30 miles of designated “C” routes in each of these areas. These designated “C” routes were originally identified and approved for use in the Spangler Hills OHV Area Management Plan (1992).

If the Johnson Valley-to-Parker Valley Race route is determined to be no longer viable or otherwise deleted, additional (C) open routes may be designated outside of OHV Open Areas with appropriate NEPA and consistent with the 2006 WEMO Plan and the applicable travel management plan(s).

This alternative would specify a Johnson Valley race or speed-controlled route-connector loop between non-connecting portions of the remaining Johnson Valley OHV Recreational Area to provide a loop corridor that enhances organized vehicle riding opportunities within the Open Area, subject to additional consultations. This may require additional coordination with the Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps. Staging and pit areas would be limited to within the Johnson Valley OHV Recreation Area.

- VIII. Alternative 4 would add Koehn, Cuddeback, Coyote, and Chisholm Trail Lake lakebeds to the list of designated Lakebeds, and would designate Koehn lakebed as “Closed to Motor Vehicle Access, except by Authorization, including Special Recreation Permit”, and designate the other three lakebeds as “Open” to motorized vehicles.
- IX. Alternative 4 would limit camping to previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 50 feet from the route centerline inside DWMAs, while stopping and parking would be limited to within 50 feet of the centerline within DWMAs, except as site-specifically designated. Outside of DWMAs, camping would be limited to previously disturbed areas adjacent to routes within 100 feet from the route centerline except as site-specifically designated, while stopping and parking would be limited to within 100 feet of centerline, except as site-specifically designated.

- Where needed, designated SPC, secondary-vehicle staging areas, and trailheads may be identified and evaluated on previously disturbed areas that connect with the designated route network and that extend beyond these parameters, with appropriate signing and access restrictions, in order to limit proliferation in popular or sensitive areas, and subject to site-specific analysis.
- X. In Alternative 3, the permit system established for motor-vehicle access to the Rands Mountains-Fremont Valley Management area would be replaced with a limited designated network that is intensively managed. Initial management parameters would be identified in the travel management plan. Other general ACEC parameters would remain unchanged from the No Action alternative.
 - XI. Livestock grazing would not change in active allotments. Livestock grazing would be discontinued in inactive allotments in DWMAs and CHU. Through this land-use planning change, lands would no longer be available for livestock grazing in three inactive, vacant allotments in their entirety, and a small portion of another consistent with 43 CFR 4130.2 (a). The inactive, vacant allotments include: a small portion of the Johnson Valley Allotment, Cronese Lake and Harper Lake Allotments entirely. The AUMs in the allotments would be reallocated from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions. See Table 2.4-3 in Section 2.4 for a comparison of acres available for grazing between alternatives.

Implementation Decisions for Route Designation/Minimization under Alternative 4

Routes and linear features in the 2013 route inventory were reviewed against the 43 CFR 8342.1 criteria for possible inclusion in the Alternative 4 travel network. The designations for routes in this alternative reflect the overall goals and objectives of Alternative 4, and mediate against changes to the designated route network in the absence of specific issues driving changes that are could not be addressed through other measures. The following parameters were used to identify the preliminary Alternative 4:

- a. Initial No Action alternative designations were used for Alternative 4, then subject to revision based on issues identified during scoping and network connectivity modifications. These were subject to GIS analysis to highlight potential remaining conflicts under the 43 CFR criteria and to address other issues, prior to site-specific review.
- b. SPC parameters were further limited outside of DWMAs, specific to Alternative 4 (see plan amendment IX), and used to further focus the impacts from criteria resources and the need for additional minimization strategies and mitigation measures.
- c. Alternative 4 used the same minimization thresholds to highlight these conflicts as Alternative 3 (see Table 2.3-7). However, since Alternative 4 did identify initial designations, the overall inclusion of additional route miles that were not in the 2005 WEMO Plan evaluations is relatively low as compared to Alternative 3.
- d. In keeping with the focus of Alternative 4 on community, public, and other access needs and issues, when specific routes do not have new internal or external route-specific feedback, or do not otherwise trigger designation criteria under the 43CFR 8342.1 designation criteria, the preliminary designation does not change from the No Action

Alternative. For routes designated as “Open” or “Limited” in the No Action Alternative, the preliminary designation under Alternative 4 became “Motorized” or “Motorized-Authorized”. If other limitations were in place, these would be included in the preliminary designations as well (e.g. Authorized, Administrative, Motorcycle, etc). For routes designated as “Closed” in the No Action Alternative, the preliminary designation under Alternative 4 became “Closed” (i.e., Transportation Linear Disturbance) to network promote watershed and habitat values. Likewise, features which were not designated in 2006 (i.e., features that were added in 2013 as a result of the on-the-ground and GTLF inventory update), would be designated “Closed” to enhance watershed and habitat values unless there were an identified network continuity issue. These continuity issues may include connectivity for specific types of use networks (e.g. motorcycle, bicycle, etc.).

- e. For routes where comments, communities, tribes or agencies recommended a route be changed from “Closed” to “Open” or “Limited” designation with a specific rationale for the access change, to enhance recreational or other access, or to replace another lost opportunity, the route would be initially designated “Open” or “Limited”. In keeping with the community access focus of Alternative 4, this process defaulted to modifying the designation of these features to be “Open” motorized routes (or for a specific requested use), then reviewing the route under the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria to determine if any conflicts would mediate in favor of designation of “Transportation Linear Disturbance” or if further mitigation was needed. This included routes that were added to the inventory after 2006 in the 2013 update. However, the larger network approach to Alternative 4 was to limit changes to the 2006 WEMO Plan network, consistent with the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria; changes as a result of comments that would substantially increase access or change the character of access in a group of routes in a larger area were generally deferred to Alternative 3, if appropriate. Changes where multiple options presented themselves would have been considered under the various alternatives to give a reasonable range of alternatives, consistent with the designation criteria.
- f. For specific routes where public comments, communities, or agencies requested that the route designation be changed from “Open” to “Closed” to motorized use or limited to smaller vehicles, non-motorized vehicles, or non-mechanized vehicles for recreational or other access or to protect sensitive resources, the route would be initially designated as “Closed” or further limited. If there were multiple options, non-motorized or non-mechanized options may be provided in Alternative 2. In keeping with the community access focus of Alternative 4, this process initially identified these features as further “Limited” or “Closed”, then would review them against the rationale under the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria, and review network continuity to determine if a different designation or additional mitigation measures were appropriate. If there is a need to provide a wider range of options or maintain some level of access in an area, Alternative 4 may have been modified to account for these issues. However, the larger network approach to Alternative 4 was to limit changes to the 2006 WEMO Plan network to those triggered by the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria and route-specific comments, or to maintain network continuity; changes as a result of internal or external comments that would substantially limit access to a substantial group of routes in a larger area were generally deferred to Alternative 2, if appropriate to consider.

- g. Routes may have been changed to “Motorized” (available for all travelers, including non-motorized or non-mechanized users) or further limited specific to further user types, if no comments or community need was identified, but a range of alternatives is appropriate based on feedback on other routes, network continuity, resource issues, or avoidance of issues elsewhere, consistent with the 43 CFR 8342.1 designation criteria and subject to further route-specific analysis.
- h. Routes designated as “Limited” in the 2006 WEMO Plan decision would generally be identified as “Motorized-Authorized” or “Motorized-Administrative” (specific to the limitation), as applicable, subject to route-specific review. Many Motorized-Authorized routes would have undergone site-specific review and mitigation associated with a permit or other authorization. If conflicts were identified, these route features again were highlighted, in order to focus the route-specific review for the identified conflicts and consider additional mitigation measures. These conflicts would also be factored into determining whether routes would be available for public use and appropriate mitigation measures associated with route use.
- i. Under Alternative 4, the designation of route ending at a jurisdictional boundary or private property would generally be updated in a similar manner as those in Alternative 2 unless a range of options presented itself, consistent with the designation criteria.
- j. For routes used for, or intersecting, a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) area, the route would generally be modified to match the form of SRP use (e.g., non-motorized for mountain bike use). In the case where multiple types of SRP use exist, the route designation was deferred to the designation that other alternatives do not consider, to increase the range of alternatives. If the route intersected an SRP area, the route was designated as motorized to provide access to the area. Additional mitigation measures would be included as necessary to address criteria resources.
- k. Under Alternative 4, for routes which have multiple user conflicts, the agency deferred the designation to the considered all users under Alternative 4, consistent with the designation criteria, and identified designations that may not have been previously considered or based on designations of surrounding routes. Generally the other options would be captured in Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 to give a range of reasonable alternatives, if appropriate. Additional mitigation measures would be identified as needed.
- l. Under Alternative 4, routes intersecting a national designated trail would be designated in a similar manner as Alternatives 2 and 3, unless a specific comment was received or a range of options presented itself, consistent with the designation criteria. If the route provides access to a trailhead, it would be initially identified as motorized, unless there were no parking or staging area, or if the route is located a distance from the designated trail, it would be identified as a “Transportation Linear Disturbance” (i.e., closed) consistent with the designation criteria. If the route conflicted with trail use, such as traveling parallel to the trail, then it would generally be initially identified as a “Transportation Linear Disturbance” (i.e., closed), subject to route-specific review. Additional measures would be identified as needed.
- m. For “Open” routes from the 2006 WEMO Plan located in a disturbance hotspot, the route would be reviewed and may be changed to a “Transportation Linear Disturbance” except

as needed to maintain connectivity of the network or to key resource and recreational sites, in order to minimize impacts to air quality and prevent additional habitat disturbance to the area. Where appropriate, at least one motorized route was maintained in the various directions, unless a designation of “Transportation Linear Disturbance” (i.e., closed) was needed to improve manageability of the area. If additional conflicts existed, depending on the severity, an entire area of routes may have been closed or open with mitigation measures. Some hotspots may be identified as potential staging or camping areas under Alternative 4. Disturbance hotspots are areas which have a significant density of routes within a very small area, such as historic vehicle play or staging areas.

The triggers used to identify a potential route or area to adjust in Alternative 4 is based on minimization and mitigation that are the same under both Alternative 3 and Alternative 4, and are provided in Table 2.3-7. The transportation network associated with Alternative 4 is shown in Figure 2.3-7. The total mileage of the designated travel network and the transportation linear disturbances for each alternative, including Alternative 4, is summarized in Table 2.4-1.

This network has been developed to provide emphasis on objectives and outcomes identified by adjacent communities, private landowners, commercial and recreational users, the Desert Advisory Council, as well as public scoping, consistent with regulatory criteria and policies for natural and cultural resource and multi-species conservation. It provides greater focus on the use of cooperative agreement strategies and partnerships with stakeholders to minimize impacts to resources and implement on-the-ground management strategies.

- Destination- and Touring-access oriented Goals and Objectives.
- Area-wide minimization across all public lands.
- Conservation/Access Balanced minimization and mitigation strategy.
- Restoration focused implementation.
- 5,782 miles of motorized routes.

Network-Wide Minimization Strategies under Alternative 4

The alternative-specific network minimization strategies for Alternative 4 would be the same as those described for Alternative 3, and are described in Table 2.3-8. Additional specific parameters for each travel management area may be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Post-Designation Implementation Strategies under Alternative 4

Specific components of the alternative developed to implement the planning goals and objectives include:

1. Other Resources and Uses
 - a. Support resource conservation and enhancement goals while providing opportunities to experience the desert’s unique resource values in the plan parameters and the development of the network;

- b. Conform to proposed and adopted DRECP route parameters, in order to provide consistent proposed management strategies;
 - c. Give special attention to the goals in special areas (WSA, ACEC, NRHP sites, Tribal Areas, Riparian Areas, etc), including special recreation planning and use areas, where appropriate, the specific factors that have driven the identification and management of special areas, and associated access strategies;
 - d. Give special attention to the strategies of adjacent and overlapping land management agencies, to access needs of private landowners, and to local community and use groups with whom BLM can partner to enhance area-wide goals;
 - e. De-emphasize additions to the route network as the primary initial response to access needs--consider alternative access routes or methods to reach destinations and options in other areas, where appropriate;
 - f. De-emphasize route closure as a primary means to minimize resource and use conflicts on the remaining routes selected for the network, where consistent with area goals, as feasible;
 - g. Emphasize regional, network and tiered measures to minimize conflicts, including those which are consistent with or enhance similar strategies of other jurisdictions; and
 - h. Address specific landowner issues in the Wonder Valley area, while assuring network connectivity.
2. Primary Travelers
- a. Manage access to emphasize casual multiple-use motorized and mechanized touring, but factor in diversity in recreational experiences, where appropriate;
 - b. Provide access to recreational and non-recreational destinations that are receiving current use and not experiencing undue access-related impacts;
 - c. Consider reestablishing access in areas where strategies have been developed and successfully implemented that control unauthorized use and other undue off-route impacts.
 - d. Consider both linear and loop trail opportunities in sensitive areas that minimize impacts from off-route use;
 - e. In other areas, emphasize mitigation and enhancement strategies to provide for a reasonable amount of recreational and touring opportunities, in addition to providing through-access on public lands to establish a comprehensive network; and
 - f. Emphasize single-use or limited-use (e.g. non-motorized) trails to enhance opportunities for unique recreational experiences, where appropriate.
3. Emerging Uses
- a. Consider emerging access and access-dependent needs in development and management of the network; and
 - b. Have the route network support landscape-level conservation and use goals and strategies, and respond to changing local goals and needs, where appropriate; and

- c. Work with the Town of Apple Valley to develop a strategy in northern Apple Valley that recognizes intensive use areas south of the Stoddard Valley OHV Open Area as well as the potential north of this area for a wildlife corridor between I-15 and the Ord-Rodman DWMA that abuts and includes the southern portion of the Stoddard Valley OHV Open Area.
4. Landscape Settings
 - a. Maintain a diverse range of visual experiences in the development and management of the network, where appropriate, with special attention to special areas and destinations, consistent with other goals and objectives; and
 - b. Maintain or enhance recreational settings in the development and management of the network.
5. Means of Travel Allowed to Accomplish Objectives
 - a. Provide an array of diverse and unique uses at popular recreation destinations, where appropriate; and
 - b. Limit motorized, competitive event routes outside of OHV open areas to designated “C” routes by special recreation permit, outside of DWMA and other ACEC (see Plan Amendment VII for specific locations identified under this alternative). Additional “C” routes would also be consistent with the 2006 WEMO Plan, the applicable Travel Management Plans, and subject to the route designation process.
6. Social Conflicts Between Different Travel Types
 - a. Provide for joint use of access for visitors, local residents, and property owners except where mutually beneficial authorizations can be negotiated and are appropriate, consistent with other agencies, state and local governments;
 - b. Provide additional access opportunities to underserved motorized or non-motorized recreation types insofar as it is consistent with other objectives;
 - c. Identify existing easements for joint use routes, as needed;
 - d. Utilize minimization and mitigation measures (e.g., signing, fencing, closing routes, where appropriate) to address known safety issues, conflicts between users, and impacts to resources;
 - e. Consider access experiences and touring opportunities commensurate with the urban or rural nature of adjacent lands and the types of conflicts on the interface between urban and rural communities and adjacent jurisdictions.
 - f. Consider future available resources in making long-term commitments to serve specific recreational needs;
 - g. Address specific trespass issues when feasible; and
 - h. Emphasize shared community strategies to avoid adverse impacts in sensitive areas and promote economic and recreational access.

7. Numbers and Types of Access Points

- a. Maintain stopping, camping and parking adjacent to routes, unless in heavily impacted areas, consider dedicated camping, staging and parking or strategies to maintain widely dispersed off-route use ;
- b. Reduce motorized access through sensitive areas with disturbance hotspots;
- c. Develop partnerships or pursue area-specific strategies to address disturbance hotspots or reduce unauthorized use, as appropriate;
- d. Limit access points in high conflict areas to manage resource and social impacts; and
- e. Develop strategies to identify and publicize where access points are and how to get to them.

8. Baseline System and existing Geographical Identity and Public Knowledge

- a. Build the network from the currently approved 2006 WEMO Plan network, as modified by the court;
- b. Maintain an accurate route inventory for management purposes, and for the production of both general and recreation specific Transportation Management Network maps, and make those maps available to the public through electronic means;
- c. Pursue reciprocal easements and utilize existing public easements to facilitate management of the primary access network; and
- d. Develop site-specific strategies at popular and sensitive destinations that are experiencing substantial impacts from access, where appropriate.

9. Non-Casual Uses

- a. Identify and Direct ROW and other authorized activities to existing corridors/sites, when reasonable;
- b. Emphasize joint use of routes by multiple ROW holders, when appropriate.
- c. Provide specific access for commercial users apart from access for casual users, where appropriate.
- d. Consider adding routes to the network that have been used for commercial uses if they enhance the network, consistent with other Plan goals, when the authorization expires; and
- e. Address additional access to private lands commensurate with individual and community access needs.

10. Boundaries for Management

- a. Recognize the current Coordinated Access Planning Area (CAPA) as a separate TMA. The CAPA area consists of the Ridgecrest and El Paso Sub-regions, which would be split from the Rands and Red Mountain Sub-regions, thus creating two separate TMA.

- b. Adopt nine Travel Management Areas, the eight TMAs identified during scoping and the CAPA Area⁵, to implement the route network, and
- c. Manage access in each of these TMA to conserve sensitive resource values and areas, including sensitive biological, cultural, and other factors, consistent with the CDCA Plan as modified by the 2006 WEMO Plan, as well as adopted ACEC Plans.
- d. Manage access in each of the TMAs to enhance special features or areas and identified resource protection and recreation management goals and facilities within or adjacent to them.
- e. Stress partnerships with communities, environmental and user groups to facilitate implementation of the transportation and travel management plan, and enhance local transportation and related development and conservation objectives.

Future changes to the network would be developed consistent with these goals and objectives, and specific direction in travel management plans. General implementation direction is identified in Table 2.3-6. Any other specific parameters for each travel management area would be included in the proposed travel management plans.

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Under Alternative 4, implementation strategies are as outlined in Table 2.3-8. Monitoring and rehabilitation priorities in the Route Signing Plan posted at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave__wemo.html, would be adjusted based on new information. The court ordered monitoring would continue, under the existing protocol, consistent with the details of the protocol. The priorities for implementation are based on a combination of factors including biological, wilderness, cultural, proximity to urban interface, and readiness, which would continue to be general guidance. Travel management plans would provide more specific guidance within the Subregions, and may also factor in specific community, recreational and other access implementation priorities, depending on the area. The basis of the biological priorities is outlined in more detail in the 2005 WEMO FEIS, page 2-164. These would be augmented with additional priorities related to other sensitive resources, particularly in special areas or where critical needs have been identified by staff and management. In addition to higher use DWMA areas, DWMA adjacent to OHV Open Areas, and higher density tortoise areas, critical ACEC resources, adversely affected riparian areas and springs, and at-risk listed and eligible cultural properties would be high priorities.

In addition, BLM would continue to seek funding opportunities and other resources to expand the current education and outreach community partnership and other partnerships in the WEMO area.

Under Alternative 4, the parameters for route network changes for the WEMO Planning area would be updated to reflect actual operational needs and provide for adjustment of the network, consistent with parameters in the travel management plans and general thresholds for plan amendment changes outlined in Section 2.7. Opening or closing routes would be subject to appropriate NEPA compliance in all cases, including appropriate consultations, except in the

⁵ TMA 7 would consist of the remaining two sub-regions—the Rands and Red Mountain.

case of emergencies, in which case NEPA would be completed consistent with regulatory requirements. These changes would occur within the parameters set in the 2006 WEMO Plan.

2.4 Comparison of Alternatives

Comparison of Networks Between Alternatives

For comparison of the No Action Alternative to the other alternatives, it is important to note that the terminology associated with designation of route networks changed as a result of BLM's 2012 TTM Handbook. Prior to 2012, individual routes in OHV Limited Areas were designated in the CDCA Plan as Open, Limited, or Closed, and those are the designations assigned to routes within the No Action Alternative.

In the 2012 TTM Handbook, the terminology was modified. As discussed in Section 2.3, each individual transportation linear feature is designated as either part of the designated travel network ("Motorized", "Non-Motorized", or "Non-Mechanized"), or as Transportation Linear Disturbances which are not part of the travel network. The designated travel network includes motorized routes that would previously have been designated as Open or Limited, but also includes non-motorized routes, routes authorized for specific modes of travel or users, and routes with other restrictions. Transportation linear disturbances are roughly equivalent to what were previously designated as Closed routes, and are not open to any use.

This change in terminology complicates the direct, quantitative comparison of the network under the No Action Alternative versus Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. A comparison of the mileage of Open, Limited, and Closed routes under all alternatives cannot be made because these designations are not made to routes under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. Similarly, a comparison of the mileage of the non-motorized network cannot be done because this designation was not made under the No Action Alternative. Though some comparisons can be done between the No Action and action alternatives (2, 3, and 4), and are presented in Table 2.4-1 below, these comparisons need to be considered within the context of this change in process and terminology. Table 2.4-2 summarizes the differences between the features of the alternative route networks.

Table 2.4-1. Comparison of Length (in miles) of Alternative Route Networks

Current Designation	Alt. 1 - No Action Alternative	Designation under Action Alternatives	Alt. 2 - Resource Conservation Enhancement	Alt. 3 – Public Land Access Maintenance	Alt. 4 – Community Access Enhancement
Total Open and Limited Miles of Routes in Network	5,338	Motorized Routes in Network	4,293	10,428	5,782
Total Open and Limited Potential Disturbance Acres from the Network	190,474	Motorized Routes in Network	49,165	201,712	101,866
Limited – designated for Motorcycle use	38.3	Limited – designated for Motorcycle use	228.5	147	120.9

Table 2.4-1. Comparison of Length (in miles) of Alternative Route Networks

Current Designation	Alt. 1 - No Action Alternative	Designation under Action Alternatives	Alt. 2 - Resource Conservation Enhancement	Alt. 3 – Public Land Access Maintenance	Alt. 4 – Community Access Enhancement
Non-Motorized routes not designated prior to 2012		Non-Motorized Routes	28	95	63
Non-Mechanized routes not designated prior to 2012		Non-Mechanized Routes	35	33	22
Closed	2,398	Closed (Transportation Linear Disturbances)	10,599	4,404	9,076
No Route-Specific Designation, Presumed Closed	7,214 (estimated)	These routes have now been evaluated under action alternatives			

Table 2.4-2. Comparison of Features of Alternative Route Networks

Feature	Alt. 1 - No Action Alternative	Alt. 2 - Resource Conservation Enhancement	Alt. 3 – Public Land Access Maintenance	Alt. 4 – Community Access Enhancement
Facilities and Improvements Focus	Existing and Limited site-specific: Popular areas	Existing and Limited site-specific: Conservation goals	Existing and Limited site-specific: Popular areas and Recreation opportunities	Area and site-specific: Advance area goals and partnerships
Stopping and Parking Limits	DWMA: 50 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: 300 feet from centerline	DWMA: 50 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: 50 feet from centerline	DWMA: 50 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: 100 feet from centerline	DWMA: 50 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: 100 feet from centerline
Camping Limits	Adjacent to routes, consistent with regulations DWMA: Previously existing sites adjacent to routes designated open Non-DWMA: Within 300 feet from routes designated open	DWMA: Previously existing sites within 50 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: Previously existing sites within 50 feet from centerline	DWMA: Previously existing sites within 100 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: Within 100 feet from centerline	DWMA: Previously existing sites within 100 feet from centerline Non-DWMA: Within 100 feet from centerline

Results of Preliminary Transportation Network Designation Process

As discussed in Section 2.3.1, the current inventory of linear transportation features in the GTLF was developed for the WMRNP by beginning with the 2006 WEMO Plan designated route

network in GIS, and then adding linear features identified through the review of NAIP aerial photos. This resulted in an updated GTLF that represented the on-the-ground inventory of linear features as of early 2013. This inventory comprises a total of 14,943 miles of linear features.

Within this inventory, the subset of linear features that are in the 2006 WEMO Plan designated route network comprise the No Action Alternative. As discussed above, the linear features within this alternative were designated as Open, Limited, or Closed. The mileage of the network within the No Action Alternative is 5,338 miles, but this total comprises only motorized routes designated as Open or Limited, and does not include Closed Routes or non-motorized routes.

Then, to develop Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, each linear feature in the inventory was considered within the context of the objectives of that alternative. Based on a review of the objectives and the coincidence of the route with potentially impacted resources, the route was either included in the designated travel network, or was considered to be a transportation linear disturbance. Sub-designations were also made, including identification of the route as motorized, non-motorized, or non-mechanized; identification of specific modes of travel; and identification of minimizations including authorization/permit, administrative, or seasonal restrictions.

For Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, the alternatives vary the specific designations made to each inventoried linear feature in order to achieve resource protection, recreation access, and community access goals, but the inventory used to develop the route network assignments was the same for all alternatives. As a result of the designation decisions made in the WMRNP, the physical on-the-ground network may be modified, including physical closure of routes currently open to motorized vehicle use as well as the opening of currently closed routes. These routes would be reclassified as transportation linear disturbances, motorized, non-motorized, or non-mechanized.

Preferred Alternative – Public Lands Access Maintenance (Alternative 3)

The Agency Preferred Alternative in the Draft SEIS is Alternative 3. Initial output from Alternative 3 included strategies to minimize impacts, and integrated some elements of Alternatives 1, 2 and 4 in order to enhance community values, address DAC issues, and respond to specific agency comments, consistent with Alternative 3 goals and objectives. Additional mitigation has been incorporated where appropriate to address these changes. Alternative 3 includes a much larger network than the network approved under the 2006 WEMO Plan, but also proposes to close 2,000 more miles of additional routes than those that were designated closed in the 2006 WEMO Plan. Alternative 3 proposes to make available to the public, or to authorized users, 10,428 miles of motorized routes, and also proposes to address closure of 4,404 miles of routes.

The preferred alternative is intended to provide recreational, local, and commercial access on routes in the planning area that do not result in unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources. The preferred alternative also proposes to maintain access on routes that are being used appropriately, that is, to the extent their use is not causing unnecessary and undue impacts to public lands and resources. The closure of 4,404 miles under the preferred alternative is an increase in the 2,400 miles of closures approved in the 2006 WEMO ROD.

The Final SEIS proposed action will be selected after circulation of the Draft SEIS alternatives and analysis, and may include a combination of one or more Draft SEIS alternatives. It will take into consideration comments on the Draft SEIS from local jurisdictions, other agencies, tribes,

and the public, as well as further consultation with USFWS and the SHPO. It may also reflect ongoing data collection and GIS updates under way for the plan.

Summary Comparison of Livestock Grazing Proposals Between Alternatives

Livestock Grazing Proposals Common to all Alternatives

An allotment by allotment comparison of alternatives is provided in Table 2.4-3. All alternatives would do the following:

Conform the CDCA Plan, as amended, to show that the Lava Mountain and Walker Pass Common Allotments have been permanently relinquished under the authority of the 2012 Appropriations Act (Public Law 112-74). The associated AUMs have been reallocated from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions.

The 2006 WEMO Plan made the majority of ephemeral sheep/cattle allotments in DWMA unavailable for grazing use, raised minimum forage levels for ephemeral grazing turnout, and discontinued the use of ephemeral and temporary non-renewable grazing authorizations within cattle allotments located in DWMA.

The 2006 WEMO Plan also allowed for voluntary relinquishment of sheep and cattle allotments within the West Mojave Planning Area that would benefit species conservation or enhance desert tortoise recovery. This provision is available for all grazing allotment that meet this criteria under all alternatives.

Under Alternative 1 - No Action

Under this alternative, livestock grazing would continue under the terms and conditions contained in the Final Grazing Decisions issued for active grazing allotments subsequent to the release of the 2006 WEMO Plan within the West Mojave Planning Area. Six inactive, vacant allotments would remain available for potential future grazing, subject to site-specific NEPA analysis and determination of grazing suitability, consistent with the West Mojave Plan terms and conditions and additional conditions as identified in the allotment specific NEPA analysis. If found unsuitable, an allotment would be unavailable to grazing.

Under Alternative 2 - Resource Conservation Enhancement

Under Alternative 2, livestock would be discontinued and there would be a reallocation of AUMs for all livestock grazing within DWMA and CHU, with the exception of one small horse allotment. This would make livestock grazing unavailable in portions of the Ord Mountain and Johnson Valley Allotments, the entire Harper Lake and Cronese Lake Allotments, and portions of Cantil Common and Shadow Mountain Allotments. Livestock grazing would continue on the Valley Well Allotment, which is not within DWMA but is within a CHU.

Under Alternative 3 - Public Lands Access Maintenance

Under Alternative 3, livestock grazing would be discontinued on currently inactive, vacant allotments, both within and outside of DWMA and CHU and within desert tortoise habitat.

There would be a reallocation of AUMs from livestock forage to wildlife use and ecosystem functions and make these allotments unavailable for livestock grazing.

Under Alternative 4 - Community Access Enhancement

Under Alternative 4, livestock grazing would be discontinued and there would be a reallocation of AUMs on a livestock grazing allotment only within DWMA's and CHU, if the allotment is currently inactive and vacant or if the allotment becomes vacant. This would include a small portion of the Johnson Valley Allotment, and the entire Harper Lake and Cronese Lake Allotments. Three other inactive, vacant allotments not within DWMA's or CHU, would remain available for potential future grazing, subject to site-specific NEPA analysis and determination of grazing suitability, consistent with the West Mojave Plan terms and conditions and additional conditions as identified in the allotment specific NEPA analysis. If found unsuitable, an allotment would be unavailable to grazing.

Table 2.4-3. Comparison of Alternative Grazing Program Allotment Components

Allotment	Alternative	Allotment Acres Remaining Outside DWMA/CHU	Allotment Acres Remaining Within DWMA/CHU	AUMs
Antelope Valley	1 - No Action	7,158	0	0
	2 - Resource Conservation	7,158	0	0
	3 - Public Land Access	7,158	0	0
	4 - Community Access	7,158	0	0
Boron	1	11,202	0	0
	2	11,202	0	0
	3	11,202	0	0
	4	11,202	0	0
Bissell	1	777	0	0
	2	777	0	0
	3	777	0	0
	4	777	0	0
Buckhorn Canyon	1	7,634	0	0
	2	7,634	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	7,634	0	0
Cady Mountain	1	160,104	0	2,010
	2	160,104	0	2,010
	3	0	0	0
	4	160,104	0	2,010
Cantil Common	1	196,171	6,726	0
	2	196,171	0	0
	3	196,171	6,726	0
	4	196,171	6,726	0

Table 2.4-3. Comparison of Alternative Grazing Program Allotment Components

Allotment	Alternative	Allotment Acres Remaining Outside DWMA/CHU	Allotment Acres Remaining Within DWMA/CHU	AUMs
Cronese Lake	1	22,517	25,992	500
	2	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	0	0	0
Double Mountain	1	2	0	38
	2	2	0	38
	3	0	0	0
	4	2	0	38
Goldstone	1	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	0	0	0
Gravel Hills	1	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	0	0	0
Hansen Common	1	34,848	0	354
	2	34,848	0	354
	3	34,848	0	354
	4	34,848	0	354
Harper Lake	1	2,182	15,936	600
	2	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	0	0	0
Johnson Valley	1	108,757	429	0
	2	108,757	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	108,757	0	0
Kelso Peak	1	2,718	0	132
	2	2,718	0	132
	3	2,718	0	132
	4	2,718	0	132
Lacey-Cactus-McCloud	1	147,488	0	1,469
	2	147,488	0	1,469
	3	147,488	0	1,469
	4	147,488	0	1,469
Monolith-Cantil	1	10,825	0	0
	2	10,825	0	0
	3	10,825	0	0
	4	10,825	0	0

Table 2.4-3. Comparison of Alternative Grazing Program Allotment Components

Allotment	Alternative	Allotment Acres Remaining Outside DWMA/CHU	Allotment Acres Remaining Within DWMA/CHU	AUMs
Oak Creek	1	23	0	16
	2	23	0	16
	3	0	0	0
	4	23	0	16
Olancho	1	13,762	0	606
	2	13,762	0	606
	3	13,762	0	606
	4	13,762	0	606
Ord Mountain	1	18,898	117,290	3,632
	2	18,898	0	508
	3	18,898	117,290	3,632
	4	18,898	117,290	3,632
Rattlesnake Canyon	1	26,832	0	1,081
	2	26,832	0	1,081
	3	26,832	0	1,081
	4	26,832	0	1,081
Round Mountain	1	15,253	0	880
	2	15,253	0	880
	3	15,253	0	880
	4	15,253	0	880
Rudnick Common	1	163,842	0	6,218
	2	163,842	0	6,218
	3	163,842	0	6,218
	4	163,842	0	6,218
Shadow Mountain	1	16,364	601	0
	2	16,364	0	0
	3	16,364	601	0
	4	16,364	601	0
Spangler Hills	1	57,695	0	0
	2	57,695	0	0
	3	57,695	0	0
	4	57,695	0	0
Stoddard Mountain	1	16,889	0	0
	2	16,889	0	0
	3	16,889	0	0
	4	16,889	0	0
Superior Valley	1	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	4	0	0	0

Table 2.4-3. Comparison of Alternative Grazing Program Allotment Components

Allotment	Alternative	Allotment Acres Remaining Outside DWMA/CHU	Allotment Acres Remaining Within DWMA/CHU	AUMs
Tunawee	1	51,729	0	0
	2	51,729	0	0
	3	51,729	0	0
	4	51,729	0	0
Valley Well	1	0	480	24
	2	0	480	24
	3	0	480	24
	4	0	480	24
Warren	1	584	0	55
	2	584	0	55
	3	584	0	55
	4	584	0	55

2.5 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Evaluation

Density cap on routes

Specific route density caps (mileage and township) were considered at length in the 2006 WEMO Plan for the entire Desert Tortoise (DT) Category I and Category II habitat areas. The alternative was dismissed due to the arbitrary nature of the density caps, which had no basis in the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan or the scientific literature. The alternative was dismissed from further analysis in favor of a process that considered specific issues known to be associated with desert tortoise sensitivity (2005 WEMO Plan FEIS, p. 2-26). In addition, the area wide density would need to consider the relative importance of other criteria resource values, which are also tied to specific factors related to each resource. Opening or closure of a route may result in specific impacts to criterion resources. The process of making a route designation for features based only on the area designation precludes a feature-specific consideration of resource impacts, as required by 43 CFR 8342.1. Therefore this approach was again dismissed from further analysis.

1985-1987/ACEC Route Network Alternative

This alternative would keep in place the specific route designations as they existed prior to the June, 2003 adopted interim route network. This alternative was also considered at length in the 2005 WEMO FEIS (pp. 2-228-229) and dismissed from further consideration. The alternative was dismissed due to several reasons: These issues are still valid—the network has continuity issues and design flaws. Inaccuracies were found in locating routes in the open route network and the network lacked connectivity, particularly at the edges with ACECs and with networks on adjacent lands. It no longer provides a reasonable network adjacent to substantially developed areas in the southern portions of the planning area. Substantial new rights-of-way, urban development, and other commercial and access development has occurred since that time. While the 1985-1987 network did a fair job at documentation of its rationales for many of the closures

and limitations under 43 CFR 8342.1, it did not do as good a good documentation job for routes that were left open.

In addition, a multitude of changes in resource conditions have ensued since these designations, which are more than 20 years old. The network was developed prior to the listing of the desert tortoise as threatened and the designation of CHU. This network was developed prior to the California Desert Protection Act, which designated areas of the planning area as wilderness, prior to an OHV area addition and boundary adjustments, prior to many ACEC designations and boundary or management plan adjustments, prior to the listing of various plants, prior to the significant growth of the Victor Valley region, etc. Major changes have also occurred in the grazing program and due to major fires that resulted in watershed level changes in plant cover. For these reasons, the 1985-1987 network was not carried forward for analysis.

2.6 Modifying the Plan

Most network and other implementation strategy changes would require NEPA review but not a plan amendment, because they would not result in an alteration of the underlying management plan. Thresholds for changing the Land Use Plans are outlined in 43 CFR 1610.5-5, which states that an amendment should be considered if there is a need to consider "a proposed action that may result in a change to the scope of resource uses or a change in the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan." Major changes (Table 2.3-6) may require evaluation for plan amendment. The general factors to be considered to determine if a plan amendment evaluation is warranted under 43 CFR 1610.5-5, and to determine if development of additional location-specific plan amendment thresholds are warranted include:

- Network changes substantially alter overall motor-vehicle use patterns in a subregion.
- Network or strategy changes require revision of WEMO Planning area goals or overall TMA goals.
- Network changes involve large acquisitions or disposals with multiple access options or adjustments.
- Network changes involve addition of substantial (improved) routes to the current network that are not part of a larger project-specific review.
- Changes involve new route construction outside an existing transportation or utility corridor in excess of parameters (e.g., minor re-alignment) outlined on page 2-167 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS.

Network and implementation strategies should be adequate to address sensitive resource values in the area, including being adaptive to new information (e.g., new listings of species, responsive to fire damage, etc.). Thresholds for changing the planning elements of this amendment would be consistent with the guidance of the CDCA Plan (1999, rewrite, p. 119), as amended, including parameters identified in parts of the 2006 WEMO Plan (e.g., 1% limitation on new disturbances) that are not being proposed for amendment herein. Location-specific parameters for network changes that could trigger a plan amendment may be established on a travel management area or Subregion-specific basis, as appropriate. At this point, location-specific triggers have not been identified, but may be established as a result of public and other agency comment. This guidance would augment Section 2.2.6.11 of the 2005 WEMO FEIS.